

Number 4
THE IMPACT OF INDIAN HISTORY ON THE
TEACHING OF UNITED STATES HISTORY

Washington Conference
1985

Copyright by
The Newberry Library

1986

Made possible as part of a grant

EH 20390-84

Educational Division of the
National Endowment for the Humanities

and by a grant from the

Lloyd A. Fry Foundation

Table of Contents

Title Page
Table of Contents
Introduction

Essay I:	"Indians in Colonial History."	1
	Neal Salisbury, Smith College	
	Comment and Classroom Application:	27
	Michael Zuckerman, University of Pennsylvania	
Essay II:	"American Expansion in the Nineteenth Century."	43
	R. David Edmunds, Texas Christian University	
	Comment and Classroom Application:	73
	Judith Sealander, Wright State University	
Essay III:	"Indians in the Twentieth Century."	95
	Donald L. Parman, Purdue University	
	Comment and Classroom Application:	121
	Donald L. Fixico, University of Wisconsin/Milwaukee	
Essay IV:	"Indians in United States Civil Rights History."	135
	W. Richard West, Jr. and Kevin Gover, Fried, Frank, Harris, Shriver and Jacobsen, Washington, D.C.	
Essay V:	"Indians in the American Revolution."	171
	Bernard W. Sheehan, Indiana University	
	Comment and Classroom Application:	205
	Mary Beth Norton, Cornell University	
Essay VI:	"Indians in Southern History."	213
	Theda Perdue, Clemson University	
Appendix I:	James H. Merrell, Vassar College Supplementary Reading List for Eastern Indians	241
Appendix II:	William R. Swagerty, University of Idaho Supplementary Bibliography for audio-visual materials.	261

INTRODUCTION

The second conference on "The Impact of Indian History on the Teaching of American History" was held at the Smithsonian Institution in Washington, D.C., October 2-5, 1985. The conference was one of a series organized by the D'Arcy McNickle Center for the History of the American Indian and supported by funding from the National Endowment for the Humanities and Lloyd A. Fry Foundation. The third and final conference in the series will take place in Los Angeles, September 24-27, 1986.

Seventy-five participants, selected primarily from the eastern half of the country, gathered at the Smithsonian's National Museum of American History to hear presentations and to discuss ways of incorporating the emerging scholarship in Indian history into existing courses of instruction. In the major sessions, speakers addressed important topics in Indian history and commentators offered syllabi and suggestions for classroom applications. In addition, a series of workshops addressed the use of audio-visual, bibliographical and textbook materials in the teaching of American Indian history.

This publication, Volume 4 in the McNickle Center's Occasional Papers in Curriculum Series papers and commentary from the major sessions, and guides to the use of bibliographical and audio-visual materials. It is being distributed to all participants in the 1985 conference, and will be included in the registration materials for the Los Angeles conference. The contents are designed for sharing and circulation among colleagues, so that the ideas can be disseminated to all teachers of American history survey courses.

Editing of the papers, for the most part, has been confined to achieving a measure of internal consistency and avoiding unnecessary repetition within the volume. The papers are copyrighted in their present form, although the center plans to publish a final selection of papers from all three conferences. Additional copies can be obtained by writing to: The D'Arcy McNickle Center for the History of the American Indian, The Newberry Library, 60 West Walton Street, Chicago, Illinois 60610.

Indians in Colonial History

Neal Salisbury

Smith College

As the textbooks have it, the place of Native Americans in the colonial period can be summed up in two or three succinct statements: they were here first; they lost a lot of wars; and, between these two in some books now, many died from European diseases. Whatever discussions of pre-Columbian cultures they offer in their opening paragraphs has no intrinsic relationship to what follows on colonial history in general or on Native Americans in particular, except for the implication that those cultures were clearly inadequate in the face of the future "American" society. Though the texts no longer gloat over this country's "manifest destiny" or the superiority of "civilized" peoples to "savages," their underlying message remains the same: Indian people were losers who never made any history, their own or anyone else's. Yet, as Fernand Braudel has pointed out, history is not made simply by those whom we choose to identify as winners. "Losing movements," as he puts it, "are forces which have at every moment affected the final outcome."¹

If we take our cue from Braudel, colonial North America appears as a period that was particularly rich in historical possibilities. For it constituted an ongoing encounter of peoples from at least four continents and many more cultural traditions and historical backgrounds. While it was initiated by one group of Europeans and ultimately dominated by another, what happened along the way was the

outcome of a multitude of complex social and cultural interactions which scholars have only begun to understand. Of course, colonial America was much more than a colorful mixing of peoples. As Eric Wolf has reminded us, that mixing was directly tied to a series of larger developments in world history that shaped the configuration of political and economic forces that prevail to this day.² To do justice to our subject, then, our histories must account both for what Native Americans brought to the colonial scene, in terms of cultural traditions and historical backgrounds that long antedated the arrival of outsiders from other continents, and for the large-scale transformations which Indians and non-Indians alike confronted from the sixteenth through eighteenth centuries. By so doing, we can begin to consider Indian history as a dimension of colonial history, to incorporate rather than merely include the first Americans. In the time remaining, I want to suggest some of the effects of such a consideration on the traditional outline of colonial history.

Our starting point is contexts. To the extent that native and European backgrounds to the colonial period are considered in textbooks at all, the result is typically a static portrait of discrete Indian tribes alongside a picture of "dynamic" western Europe. A recent variation, prompted by the impulse to include Indians, portrays the Aztecs, Mayans, and Incas of Middle and South America as civilizations comparable to those of Europe. But such efforts still leave Native North Americans wanting in the scale of cultural values which the texts implicitly promote and, more to the point, oversimplify and distort the histories of both Indians and Europeans. On both continents in the late fifteenth century, there

were tensions between the local, the particular, and the traditional on one hand, and dynamic, larger-scale forces for change on the other. Our first task is to establish the nature of these tensions in order to determine what effect they had on subsequent Indian-European relations.

What we might term the "social baseline" for native North America was established during the long Archaic period, from roughly the eighth millennium B.C. to the first, as small bands of a few dozen individuals each moved into virtually every ecological niche and gradually learned to exploit the resources available for their food and other needs. Though the results varied from the arid deserts of the west to the lush forests of the east, these kin-based, egalitarian bands were generally self-sufficient in terms of subsistence and other basic needs, even while reciprocal exchanges with neighbors brought resources, goods, and ideas from all over the continent.³

The durability of these Archaic patterns is apparent in the way Native Americans subsequently developed agriculture. Rather than rushing headlong into an "agricultural revolution" at the first opportunity, Indians gradually and selectively added plant domestication and cultivation to Archaic food production schedules over the course of centuries. In so doing they preserved lifeways based on minimal labor and on carefully balanced relationships with their natural environments rather than embrace new ones with material, social, and religious implications that could have been only dimly understood. The growth of populations in relation to land and the arrival from Mexico of superior strains of maize, beans, and squash were probably the major factors in the eventual primacy of agriculture

almost everywhere that climate permitted. Yet even these developments did not signal an abandonment of older subsistence patterns or the succumbing to a way of life defined in Mesoamerica. For simultaneous with the adoption of agriculture was a major development in hunting technology: the replacement of the spear-thrower by the bow and arrow, introduced from Asia via the Arctic.⁴

The advent of agriculture eventually encouraged the development of exchange networks on a scale far greater than before. The most spectacular example was Cahokia, near modern St. Louis, a full-scale urban marketing center from which the exchange of goods throughout mid-America and the southeast from the tenth century to the thirteenth was coordinated. It was this activity which gave rise to the cultural florescence known as Mississippian, with its spectacular temple plazas and burial mounds. The plazas and mounds served as the setting for the elaborate rituals which accompanied these exchanges and the chiefs, living and dead, who oversaw them. Yet the veneration in which the chiefs and their ancestors were held had more to do with the sacred nature of their positions than with their ability to impose their wills on others. Despite their prestige and the vast amount of material wealth they gained for themselves and their communities, the village-bands which constituted their outlying "subjects" remained self-sufficient in terms of food and other subsistence needs. So long as this was so, there were sharp limits on the authority which chiefs could extend over their tributaries. That these limits were tested appears evident in much of the archaeological evidence. Indeed, one dissertation in progress, noting the rise of defense-oriented centers on the Mississippian periphery in the wake of Cahokia's decline, is

exploring the possibility that the Iroquois, Huron, and other confederations encountered by Europeans had their origins in such conflicts.⁵

At the same time, a series of developments was transforming the social landscape in the southwest. A long drought and attendant arroyo-cutting in the late thirteenth century destroyed much of the fertile cropland in the region. As a result, pueblos were consolidated into fewer and larger communities which operated large-scale irrigation projects. As the southward movement of groups of Athapaskan-speaking peoples brought them into the southwest, the Pueblos responded by shifting the focus of their trade from the south to these Apache and Navaho newcomers and others on the southern Plains. Both these developments appear to have contributed to the spread of the kachina cult, the enlargement of kivas, and other developments associated with the intensified religious life which the Spanish would soon confront in the Pueblos.⁶

Pre-Columbian America, then, was not simply a longue durée in which people, as the texts tend to put it, developed cultures or adapted to their environments. Rather it was characterized by historical processes no less momentous or dynamic, no less complex or politically charged for being less accessible to us than those for which written evidence survives. More directly to our point here, many of those processes continued to operate during the colonial period and profoundly shaped relations between Indians and Europeans and, hence, the course of colonial history.

Before proceeding to the colonial period itself, however, it would be well to consider the question of comparative contexts, North

American and west European. Until recently, early modern Europe was customarily described in terms of its dominant institutions and most dynamic developments--the Renaissance, the Reformation, the rise of nation-states, and the commercial and maritime revolutions. Against this background, expansion into the Americas was understood in terms of dynastic and religious rivalries and of desires for material and spiritual fulfillment, and the contrasts between expanding Europe and the static communities of North America could not have been more striking. But social historians now present quite a different picture of early modern Europe and the preceding late medieval period. The world they describe consisted primarily of peasants living at the level of subsistence, oriented toward kin and local communities, exchanging goods through barter, and believing in a wide range of sources of supernatural power, unconnected, if not actually counter to Christian teachings. This is the social-economic sphere which Braudel characterizes with the term, "material life," as opposed to the better known "market economy" and "capitalism" of the period. Though there was obviously a wealth of difference between a village in France or Ireland and one in Huron or Cherokee country, what these historians describe suggests a western Europe with certain striking parallels to North America and, above all, one hardly expansive in its ambitions or its potential.⁷

Of course, both the older and more recent portraits of western Europe are accurate and must be seen in combination to gain a full picture of the region just before and during the colonial period. For it is internal conflict between the traditional world and an emerging new order that underlies much of early modern European history.

Whether or not so intended, the activities of merchants, commercially-minded landowners, nation-builders, religious inquisitors and reformers, and others tended to undermine the traditional cultures of western Europe's villages and countrysides. At the same time, these activities impelled overseas expansion and shaped the attitudes and policies of colonizers toward the peoples they encountered beyond Europe's shores so that the histories of early modern Europe and of colonial North America are linked by such themes as the lifting of customary restraints on the quest for wealth and on the uses of land and labor; the expanded powers and claims of territorial nation-states, particularly notions of sovereignty and the duties of subjects; the rise of commercial classes and associated claims as to the rights of property; the efforts to eradicate allegedly pagan and Satanic heresies in favor of one or another variety of institutionalized Christian orthodoxy; and the emergence of prescribed lifestyles stressing "civility" and the value of work.⁸

Textbooks overlook not only the context of colonial history but its beginnings. To hear them tell it, American history began with the establishment of permanent settlements at Jamestown in 1607 and Plymouth in 1620, as if these developments could be comprehended without an understanding of Indian-European relations in the sixteenth century. Over the course of this "century of vain attempts," as it has been termed, hundreds of Europeans and their African and Latin American followers pursued conquistador-inspired dreams of wealth from the St. Lawrence to the Rio Grande, only to be rebuffed. At the same time and less spectacularly, European fishermen, responding to the demands of a growing population and a commercializing economy at home,

expanded their operations to the Atlantic coast, particularly the Newfoundland-Gulf of St. Lawrence area where contacts with natives became regular and, on the mainland, evolved into specialized trade relations.⁹

With the exception of a few exploring parties, most Europeans who visited North America before 1600 never traveled beyond the coasts and lower river valleys. But because of the myriad exchange routes linking bands, tribes, and villages throughout the continent, their material goods and microbes traveled far ahead of them, in many cases reaching native communities a hundred years or more before the beginning of sustained relations with European colonists. Over the course of the century, brass and glass beads, mirrors, iron nails, awls, knives, and axes, copper pots, cloth, and countless other items of European manufacture entered native inventories as their utilitarian value or spiritual power came to be appreciated. Such exchanges were rarely the simple exchange of European trifles for Indian hospitality and beaver pelts. Coastal Indians obtained many of the goods from shipwrecks, abandoned fishing stations and other structures, and via theft. As they exchanged them inland, they also sent the sacred marine shells that would later be known as wampum, and other indigenous products that had long figured in native exchanges. As the commercial fur trade gained momentum in the last quarter of the century, Indian hunters sought to expand their hunting territories in the quest for furs. When the exchange of wampum and other gifts failed to resolve disputes amicably, groups often fought with one another. By the time the French re-entered the St. Lawrence forty years after the Cartier-Roberval voyages of 1534-41, the St. Lawrence

Iroquoians had disappeared, and the Huron and Iroquois had strengthened their confederacies. Before any colonies had been established, then, the trade in European goods fused with, even while modifying, earlier patterns of alliance and hostility.¹⁰

The Europeans' diseases also traveled ahead of them, and with far more transforming effect. The long separation of the earth's two hemispheres had isolated the peoples of the Americas from those of Eurasia and Africa so that Indians lacked immunities to diseases such as smallpox and measles which by the sixteenth century were confined to children or small-scale epidemics in Europe. The most readily apparent result of this discrepancy was in the southeast where explorers, missionaries, and others repeatedly spread epidemics that so drastically depopulated the region as to undermine the Mississippian chieftainships. By the time sustained Indian-European relations began in the southeastern interior late in the seventeenth century, new inter-village chieftainships had emerged among the survivors of the catastrophe to form the Creek, Choctaw, Chickasaw, and other tribes. But the scale of these successor tribes was smaller than that of their predecessors and, except for the Natchez on the lower Mississippi, much of the earlier ideological content was gone.¹¹

The colonies which were founded in the early seventeenth century inherited a history of Indian-European relations which determined their locations and, to a significant degree, their subsequent histories. The Powhatan confederacy had arisen over three generations preceding Jamestown's founding in response to rivalries generated by trade, to the effects of Spanish and English efforts to establish bases in the region, and to depopulation by disease.¹² English

efforts to penetrate Dutch and French trade networks in the future "New England" succeeded only after two massive epidemics depopulated portions of the region by as much as ninety percent.¹³ New France took over from earlier traders on the St. Lawrence an alliance with the Montagnais and other Algonquian-speakers plus the Huron against the League of the Iroquois. After French guns reinforced the latter's exclusion from the St. Lawrence in 1609 and 1610, they turned to the newly arrived Dutch on the Hudson as a source of trade and began a relationship that would provide the foundation of the New Netherland economy for that colony's duration.¹⁴

What differentiates the seventeenth century from the sixteenth above all is the rise of England and a new style of colonization. Spain, France, and the Netherlands sent small numbers of countrymen to treat with large numbers of Indians via *economiendas*, religious missions, and the fur trade. While the English also expected to subordinate Indians within grander economic, political, and religious schemes, they sought above all to plant new communities of their own countrymen to solve the problems generated by social and economic upheaval at home--overpopulation, underemployment, shortage of land, social and religious disorder--as well as gain access to raw materials and markets for expanding industries. These upheavals had sundered older feudal relationships far more decisively in England than in any other European country, turning land into a commodity that could easily be bought and sold and giving rise to the expectation of most English males who migrated to North America in the seventeenth century that they would own personal property in land, either immediately or after serving terms as indentured servants.¹⁵

What was noteworthy about these goals was their utopian quality--Englishmen would work the land and become independent if not rich; Indians would go along or suffer the consequences. Since Indians would only be a hindrance to the spread of English farming, the colonies pursued various practices in order to get Indian land for their settlers, including warfare, purchase, religious missions, and taking advantage of the effects of epidemics. But however much they eschewed dependence on Indians, the New England and Chesapeake colonies relied heavily on the natives during the first two generations. In the beginnings, this dependence centered on the colonists' need for food, legitimacy, and support against hostile Indians; later it included trade that bolstered colonial economies and political-military alliances against colonial rivals.¹⁶

Texts and courses customarily link the frontier conflicts which erupted in New England and the Chesapeake in the mid-1670s to pressures for expansion originating within rapidly growing colonies. That is exactly half the story. The other half lies behind the frontier and centers on the position of the Iroquois in relation not just to developments within individual colonies but also to the larger commercial and imperial rivalry among England, France, and the Netherlands. By 1630, the League of the Iroquois had established itself as the linchpin of the New Netherland economy. With their own hunting territories largely depleted of beaver, the Iroquois used Dutch-supplied guns to raid enemies carrying pelts to the French in Canada. Above all, they sought furs which they could then sell to the Dutch for more guns and other trade goods, and captives for adoption to replace the heavy attrition within their own ranks due to disease

and constant warfare. With these goals, they undertook their successful "Beaver Wars" of the 1640s and 1650s (upon which their military reputation rests), dispersing the formidable Huron, Erie, and Neutral of the eastern Great Lakes. But these were not simply wars of expansion waged to acquire wealth or power as Europeans understood those terms. The Iroquois saw the League as embodying an ideal of peace that might ultimately embrace all the peoples of the northeast. They also saw themselves as a people besieged and depleted, for whom war was necessary for their very survival.¹⁷

After 1660, the situation of the Iroquois and other native groups residing in the northeast shifted quickly and dramatically. The accessions of Charles II in England and Louis XIV in France marked the beginnings of more concerted and centralized colonial efforts by the two empires, efforts that began in North America with the English conquest of New Netherland and with moves by both powers to subordinate and make use of the Iroquois. As discontented New England Indians reacted to settler expansion and as discontented Chesapeake settlers attacked Indians occupying lands they sought for themselves, the Iroquois emerged as allies of the English, but as allies with goals of their own. With New York Governor Andros's backing, they defeated the coalition of New England bands led by Metacom, or King Philip, to mark the turning point in King Philip's War. Then as Andros offered refuge in New York to the colonists' recent adversaries, the Iroquois joined the colony in establishing and overseeing the Covenant Chain system of alliances linking Indians and colonies from Virginia to Massachusetts.¹⁸ In the meantime, French Jesuit missionaries were making inroads among the Iroquois, creating

religious and political divisions which widened during the 1680s as Iroquois warriors fought French allies, inconclusively, along a front extending from Maine to Minnesota. The Iroquois turned their factionalism to diplomatic advantage by signing a treaty of neutrality with France in 1701 to augment their special relationship with England. As a result, they continued to hunt, trade and generally limit the impact of colonization on everyday life in the Five Nations.¹⁹

A consideration of the roles of Indians, then, points up how such seemingly isolated events as Bacon's Rebellion and King Philip's War were part of a much larger, regional upheaval, one that was closely tied, moreover, to developments in Europe. The same can be said for events in the southeast and southwest during this period. The founding of Charleston, Carolina, in 1670 marked a major intrusion between Virginia fur traders to the north and the Spanish in Florida by an even more ruthless group of Englishmen. By supplying guns to favored tribes, these "Goose Creek men" rose to commercial supremacy through a thriving trade in deerskins and Indian slaves, selling the latter in the West Indian colonies whence they had come. Though both the Spanish and the Virginians had enslaved Indians, the newcomers transformed a mode of subjugation into a flourishing overseas enterprise, one that coincided with the expansion of black slavery in the British colonies via the chartering of the Royal African Company. After the Carolinians' Shawnee and Yamasee allies captured, killed, and drove from the region tens of thousands of Indians, they recognized that a similar fate awaited them and rose up in the largest nativist rebellion yet in the British colonies. Though the uprising

helped end the overseas sale of Indian slaves, this form of Indian-European exchange played a critical role in the development of South Carolina and its economy.²⁰

On the lower Mississippi River, the French established a base in 1699 from which they hoped to link up with Canada through a string of Indian alliances and to contain the English. The same fears of enslavement which drove more easterly groups to revolt against the Goose Creek men led more distant ones, such as the Choctaw, Chickasaw, and Natchez, to shift their trade relations to the less threatening newcomers. After the revolt, many Yamasees fled to the mountains to form new towns in Creek country and likewise established ties with the French.²¹

In the southwest, Spanish efforts to root out native religious beliefs and structures of authority in the Pueblos likewise provoked a major rebellion, involving Athapaskan nomads as well as the Pueblos themselves. Though the Spanish ultimately regained control of the region, they refrained from trying to reimpose the total transformation of native life which they had initially attempted.²² From the St. Lawrence to the Rio Grande, then, the closing years of the seventeenth century were marked by conflicts arising from European expansion. Yet while many native bands and tribes were vanquished, others--frequently augmented by refugees from the vanquished groups--accommodated themselves to what appeared to be new realities, if not new opportunities.

Through the first half of the eighteenth century, a number of tribes which lay beyond the range of colonial settlement maintained economic and political relationships with Europeans which they

understood in traditional terms. They exchanged furs for European goods after agreeing to prices that reflected both sides' notion of what was fair, and did so with any and all European powers in the vicinity. In the south, such exchanges reinforced redistribution by chiefs on the Mississippian pattern among the Creek, Choctaw, and Chickasaw. In the north, they reinforced an expanded Iroquois-English Covenant Chain, now expanded to include Pennsylvania. In both regions, the stronger, more favorably located groups played British and French traders and diplomats off against one another.²³

As the century wore on, however, the meaning of these relationships shifted along with the historical setting in which they were occurring. For one thing, the pressure of a growing land-hungry population made itself felt. Between 1700 and 1775, the white and black population of the British colonies increased tenfold, from a quarter million to two and a quarter million, returning the region's population at last to its probable pre-Columbian level.²⁴ Nine out of ten colonists worked the land, voluntarily or involuntarily, with an increasing proportion of their production going to urban and overseas markets. The effects of this pressure were most apparent in Pennsylvania, where Iroquois acquiescence in a series of fraudulent seizures of Delaware lands between 1737 and 1741 marked the beginning of the end of the Covenant Chain.²⁵ Closely related to the expansionist pressures of the colonies was the imperial rivalry between Britain and France. Though the two nations were formally at peace for thirty years after the Treaty of Utrecht (1713), their rivalry continued unabated in North America. France's policy was to use the fur trade to form a chain of alliances linking Louisiana to

Canada, so as to contain the English; the Indians responded, to the extent that geography permitted, by trading with both sides. After mid-century, as the fur trade's commercial potential in the east declined, the English, too, used the trade to distribute gifts and thereby secure allies. Though the form of these exchanges was consistent with those of native tradition, the Indians' value to Europeans was no longer in their productivity but in their ability to aid one power in making territorial gains at the other's expense. Only after the French were eliminated in 1763, did most inland groups recognize how vulnerable they had become.²⁶

Those bands and tribes in closer proximity to the onslaught of settlers and speculators developed strategies of accommodation that enabled them to survive as communities and to retain their distinctive identities and traditions, even as they were enveloped by the agrarian-commercial society of the newcomers. Continued depopulation from disease, the ravages of alcohol, the loss of resources--especially land--and skills, pressures to sell additional land and convert to Christianity, had varying results across colonial America. In Rhode Island, the Narragansett held on to an ever-shrinking portion of the land they had occupied long before the arrival of Europeans. After resisting Puritan missionary efforts for more than a century, they found meaning in the enthusiastic revivalism of the Great Awakening, but on their terms rather than on those of the whites around them.²⁷ The first major losses of land by the Delaware coincided with the outbreak of the Great Awakening. Thereafter both white Christian missionaries and visionary nativist prophets struck responsive chords among Delawares seeking to reconstitute their

shattered communities and lifeways as war and settler rapacity hounded them from their homeland.²⁸ Like the Narragansett, but not like the Delaware, the Catawba in North and South Carolina retained a portion of their old homeland as a reservation and continued as a distinctive community at the margin of colonial society. But unlike the others, they steadfastly resisted missionaries and continued many of the rituals and oral traditions they had known for centuries.²⁹ As in the southwest, then, Indian responses to the realities of colonization in the east varied, depending on the traditions and expectations of both natives and colonists. But what emerges in all cases is the quest for communal integrity, even in the most hostile of circumstances, an integrity that attracted blacks and whites to life in Indian communities even as Indians were, in conventional terms, "losing."³⁰

Traditional approaches to the colonial period identify their geographic area of concern as the thirteen British colonies. Yet the effects of colonization spread far beyond that narrow strip of territory. Maps of Indian North America are generally blank in the Ohio River Valley, not because it was unoccupied at the beginning of the colonial era but because the Iroquois drove out the occupants before Europeans could assign them names. In the eighteenth century, refugee Indians from the north, south, and east converged on the region under loose Iroquois suzerainty to form what one French official termed "a sort of republic" through which they organized trade and diplomatic relations.³¹ Iroquois raids in the seventeenth century and French trade and diplomatic activity thereafter likewise uprooted communities in the upper Great Lakes and in the Illinois area while the spread of tobacco plantations in Louisiana led the French to

attack and disperse the Natchez, last of the bona fide Mississippian chiefdoms, between 1729 and 1731.³² In all these areas, there was as much human turnover as in the more well studied British colonies. Moreover, these developments, and those even further west, shaped the history of Indian-white relations in the post-colonial period. The most obvious example is the horse-gun lifeway of many of the Plains tribes, formed by natives using European materials and participating in trade with Europeans but largely free of European coercion.

By now it should be apparent that a consideration of Indians in colonial American history obliges us to rethink a number of generally unquestioned assumptions about that history. While recent developments in social history have enriched our understanding of colonial America, we continue to focus on developments within the society of immigrants and creoles, overlooking the fact that colonial America was above all a social landscape in which native bands, tribes, and chiefdoms confronted, interacted with, and were eventually encompassed within an expanding European world-economy. As this paper has tried to indicate, a consideration of that transformation in all its dimensions means widening the chronological and geographic as well as disciplinary boundaries within which we have customarily written our histories.³³ It also means developing cultural sensitivities which traditional approaches have not demanded, in particular for Indians, most of whom eschewed private property, capital accumulation, and the territorial nation-state. At the same time, we must recognize that Indians belong in most of the standard topics of colonial history courses, from early exploration and first settlements through the Restoration and rebellions of the late seventeenth century, and on to

the economic development, population growth, religious revivals, and frontier and imperial conflicts of the eighteenth century. If handled properly, the results of this rethinking will be a far richer conception of our subject than is presently offered, one that gives us not only fairness and justice but good history.

Notes

1. Quoted in Herbert G. Gutman, "Work, Culture, and Society in Industrializing America, 1815-1919," American Historical Review 78 (1973), 580.
2. Eric R. Wolf, Europe and the People Without History (Berkeley, 1982).
3. D'Arcy McNickle, "Americans Called Indians," in Eleanor Burke Leacock and Nancy Oestreich Lurie, eds., North American Indians in Historical Perspective (New York, 1971), 34-38; William A. Turnbaugh, "Wide-Area Connections in Native North America," American Indian Culture and Research Journal 1:4 (1976), 22-28; Richard I. Ford, "Northeastern Archeology: Past and Future Directions," Annual Review of Anthropology 3 (1974), 389-379; Jesse D. Jennings, Prehistory of North America (2nd ed.,; New York, 1974), ch. 4.
4. Ford, "Northeastern Archeology," 401-403; James B. Griffin, "The Midlands and Northeastern United States," in Jesse D. Jennings, ed., Ancient Native Americans (San Francisco, 1978), 255-56; Richard B. Woodbury and Ezra B.W. Zubrow, "Agricultural Beginnings, 2000 B.C.-A.D. 500," in Alfonso Ortiz, ed., Southwest, Handbook of North American Indians (gen. ed., William C. Sturtevant; hereafter HNAI), vol. 9 (Washington, 1979), 43-52, 59-60. On hunter-gatherers, see Richard B. Lee and Irven DeVore, eds., Man the Hunter (Chicago, 1968); Marshall Sahlins, Stone Age Economics (Chicago, 1972).

5. Charles Hudson, The Southeastern Indians (Knoxville, 1976), 202-210; Robert L. Hall, "The Mississippian Heartland and Its Plains Relationships," Plains Anthropologist 12 (1967), 175-183; James Warren Porter, "The Mitchell Site and Prehistoric Exchange Systems at Cahokia: AD 1000±300," in Melvin Fowler, ed., Explorations into Cahokia Archaeology, Illinois Archaeological Survey, Bulletin no. 7 (Urbana, 1969), 137-164; Melvin L. Fowler, "A Pre-Columbian Urban Center on the Mississippi," Scientific American (August 1975), 92-101; Jeffrey P. Brain, "Late Prehistoric Settlement Patterning in the Yazoo Basin and Natchez Bluffs Regions of the Lower Mississippi Valley", in Bruce D. Smith, ed., Mississippian Settlement Patterns (New York, 1978), 331-368; Jon D. Muller, "The Southeast," in Jennings, ed., Ancient Native Americans, 307-322; Ford, "Northeastern Archaeology," 405-408; Robert Hassenstab, "A Core-Periphery Model for Mississippian-Iroquoian Interaction during the Late Prehistoric Period in North America" (Unpublished paper, 1984).
6. J. O. Brew, "Hopi Prehistory and History to 1850," HNAI 9:514-5; Charles H. Lange, "Relations of the Southwest with the Plains and Great Basin," ibid., 201-205; Wilcox, "Entry of Athapaskans;" E. Charles Adams, "The View from the Hopi Mesas," in David R. Wilcox and W. Bruce Masse, eds., The Protohistoric Period in the North American Southwest, AD 1450-1700, Arizona State University Anthropological Research Papers, no. 24 (Tempe, AZ, 1981), 321-335; T.J. Ferguson, "The Emergence of Modern Zuni Culture and Society: A Summary of Zuni Tribal History, A.D. 1450-1700," ibid., 336-353; David H. Snow, "Protohistoric Rio Grande Pueblo

- Economics: A Review of Trends," ibid., 354-377; David R. Wilcox, "Changing Perspectives on the Protohistoric Pueblos A.D. 1450-1700," in ibid., 378-409.
7. E.g., Emmanuel Le Roy Ladurie, Montaillou: The Promised Land of Error, trans. Barbara Bray (New York, 1978); Peter Burke, Popular Culture in Early Modern Europe (New York, 1978); Peter Laslett, The World We Have Lost, 2nd ed. (New York, 1971); Keith Thomas, Religion and the Decline of Magic (New York, 1971); Fernand Braudel, Civilization and Capitalism, 15th-18th Century, vol. 1: The Structures of Everyday Life, trans. Sian Reynolds (New York, 1981); Carlo Ginzburg, The Night Battles: Witchcraft and Agrarian Cults in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries, trans. John and Anne Tedeschi (Baltimore, 1983); Jon Butler, "The Future of American Religious History: Prospectus, Agenda, Transatlantic Problématique," William and Mary Quarterly 3d ser. 42 (1985), 167-183.
 8. Cf. Wolf, Europe and the People Without History, ch. 4; William Monter, Religion, Myth and Magic in Early Modern Europe (Athens, Ohio, 1984), esp. ch. 6.
 9. The best treatments are Carl Ortwin Sauer, Sixteenth Century North America (Berkeley, 1971) and David B. Quinn, North America from Earliest Discovery to First Settlements: The Norse Voyages to 1612 (New York, 1977), ch. 2. I here pass over the earlier Norse contacts with Native Americans as of little apparent long-range significance. See Quinn, North America, ch. 2; Robert McGhee, "Contact between Native North Americans and the Medieval Norse: A Review of the Evidence," American Antiquity 49 (1984),

4-26.

10. J. Leitch Wright, The Only Land They Knew: The Tragic Story of the Indians in the Old South, (New York, 1981) ch. 2; James Axtell, "The North American Fur Trades in the Sixteenth Century: An Overview," unpublished paper, 1985; John Dickinson, "Old Routes and New Wares: The Advent of European Goods in the St. Lawrence Valley," unpublished paper, 1985; James W. Bradley, "Native Exchange and European Trade: Cross-Cultural Dynamics in the Sixteenth Century," unpublished paper, 1985; Bruce G. Trigger, The Children of Aataentsic: A History of the Huron People to 1660 (2 vols., Montreal and London, 1976) 1:ch. 4.
11. William H. O'Neill, Plagues and Peoples (paper ed., Garden City, 1976), ch. 5; Alfred W. Crosby, "Virgin Soil Epidemics as a Factor in the Aboriginal Depopulation in America," William and Mary Quarterly 3d ser., 33 (1976), 289-299; Wright, Only Land They Knew, ch. 2; author's conversations with Charles Hudson based on Hudson's ongoing research on Spanish-Indian contacts in the sixteenth-century southeast.
12. Sauer, Sixteenth Century North America, 221-225; Wright, Only Land They Knew, 52-61 passim; Christian F. Feest, "Powhatan: A Study in Political Organization," Wiener Völkerkundliche Mitteilungen 13 (1966), 77-79.
13. Neal Salisbury, Manitou and Providence: Indians, Europeans, and the Making of New England, 1500-1643 (New York, 1982), 101-09.
14. Trigger, Children 1:228-330.
15. Cf. Gary B. Nash, Red, White, and Black: The Peoples of Early America, 2nd ed. (Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1982), chs. 2-5 passim;

- Edmund S. Morgan, American Freedom, American Slavery: The Ordeal of Colonial Virginia (New York, 1975), chs. 1-4; Salisbury, Manitou and Providence, 96-100, 166-181; William Cronon, Changes in the Land: Indians, Colonists, and the Ecology of New England (New York, 1983), ch. 4.
16. J. Frederick Fausz, "Merging and Emerging Worlds: The Interplay of Anglo-Indian Interest Groups in the Early Chesapeake," unpublished paper, 1982; Wright, The Only Land They Knew, 53-87; Salisbury, Manitou and Providence, 183-235; Salisbury, "Social Relationships on a Moving Frontier: Natives and Settlers in Southern New England, 1638-1675," unpublished paper, 1985.
 17. Daniel K. Richter, "War and Culture: The Iroquois Experience," William and Mary Quarterly 3d ser., 40 (1983), 528-559; Neal Salisbury, "Iroquois and Southern New England Algonquians in the Seventeenth Century" unpublished paper, 1985.
 18. Wright, Only Land They Knew, 88-92; Cronon, Changes in the Land, 102-103; Salisbury, "Iroquois and Southern New England Algonquians"; Francis Jennings, The Invasion of America: Indians, Colonialism, and the Cant of Conquest (Chapel Hill, 1975), chs. 17-18 passim; Jennings, The Ambiguous Iroquois Empire: The Covenant Chain Confederation of Indian Tribes with English Colonies (New York, 1984), chs. 7-8 passim; Stephen Saunders Webb, 1676: The End of American Independence (New York, 1984), 355-406.
 19. Daniel Karl Richter, "The Ordeal of the Longhouse: Change and Persistence on the Iroquois Frontier, 1609-1720" (Ph.D. Dissert., Columbia University, 1984), chs. 4-9 passim.

20. Wright, Only Land They Knew, chs. 5-6.
21. Daniel H. Usner, Jr., "Frontier Exchange in the Lower Mississippi Valley: Race Relations and Economic Life in Colonial Louisiana, 1699-1783" (Ph.D. dissert., Duke University, 1981), ch. 1.
22. Marc Simmons, "History of Pueblo-Spanish Relations to 1821," in Alfonso Ortiz, ed., Southeast, vol. 9 of Handbook of North American Indians (gen. ed., William C. Sturtevant; Washington, 1979), 187.
23. Richard White, The Roots of Dependency: Subsistence, Environment, and Social Change among the Choctaws, Pawnees, and Navajos (Lincoln, Neb., 1983), ch. 3; Jennings, Ambiguous Empire, Pt. 3; Nash, Red, White, and Black, 223-235, 239-242.
24. Cf. Historical Statistics of the United States, Colonial Times to 1970 (Washington, 1975), 1168.
25. Jennings, Ambiguous Iroquois Empire, ch. 17.
26. W. J. Eccles, "The Fur Trade and Eighteenth-Century Imperialism," William and Mary Quarterly 3d ser., 40 (1983), 341-362; Wilbur R. Jacobs, Wilderness Politics and Indian Gifts: The Northern Colonial Frontier, 1748-1763 (Stanford, 1950).
27. William S. Simmons, "Red Yankees: Narragansett Conversion in the Great Awakening," American Ethnologist 10 (1983), 253-271.
28. Anthony F.C. Wallace, "New Religions among the Delaware Indians, 1600-1900," Southwestern Journal of Anthropology 12 (1956), 1-21; Charles E. Hunter, "The Delaware Nativist Revival of the Mid-Eighteenth Century," Ethnohistory 18 (1971), 39-49.
29. James H. Merrell, "The Indians' New World: The Catawba Experience," William and Mary Quarterly 3d ser., 41 (1984),

537-565.

30. Edward H. Spicer, "Spanish-Indian Acculturation in the Southwest," with comments, American Anthropologist, new ser., 56 (1954), 663-684; Wright, Only Land They Knew, 272-278; James Axtell, "The White Indians of Colonial America," William and Mary Quarterly 3d ser., 32 (1975), 55-88.
31. William Hunter, "History of the Ohio Valley," in Bruce G. Trigger, ed., Northeast, vol. 15 of Handbook of North American Indians (gen. ed., William C. Sturtevant; Washington, 1978), 588-593.
32. J. Joseph Bauxar, "History of the Illinois Area," ibid., 594-601; Lyle M. Stone and Donald Chaput, "History of the Upper Great Lakes Area," ibid., 602-609; Usner, "Frontier Exchange in the Lower Mississippi Valley," 16-19; Nash, Red, White, and Black, 110.
33. On disciplinary boundaries, cf. James Axtell, The European and the Indian: Essays in the Ethnohistory of Colonial North America (New York, 1981), esp. ch. 1. See also two important studies which link economic and ecological issues in Indian history: Cronon, Changes in the Land; White, Roots of Dependency.

714-21-01

Comment on
Neal Salisbury
"Indians in Colonial History"

Michael Zuckerman
University of Pennsylvania

You have asked me to set forth some ways in which Neal Salisbury's work and other work like it might be applied in the classroom and, more generally, attached consequentially to conventional courses in early American history. I tremble to answer, but I answer anyway, that I do not think it can be, or at any rate do not think it will be.

You have presented me with a problem you take to be primarily intellectual: how to design a course or a curriculum that can adequately comprehend the Indians' contribution to the course of colonial development. I cringe to respond, but I respond anyway, that the problem is not primarily intellectual. You - or I should say, we - do not need a more ingenious syllabus. You - we - need a more generous audience, and until we have one we can concoct syllabi and talk to one another till the rivers cease to flow and the winds cease to blow, and it won't make more than the most trivial differences.

Indeed, I doubt whether we will ever include Indians consequentially in American history. I doubt whether we have the courage, the ethical sensitivity, or the human sympathy to do it. You here in this hall may, but your colleagues - or perhaps I had better say, I and my colleagues - do not. We speak to and for an American

culture which has been from the first an irredeemably imperial culture. We write to and for an American people who have been from the first, in William Carlos Williams' wonderful, terrifying phrase, "maimed, to our advantage, for survival." And we grow more obscenely obtuse all the time. Even as we meet here, Ronald Reagan resides a few blocks away in the White House, our twice-chosen symbol of the decay of the most minimal social sympathy, while his Congressional sycophants hold court a few blocks away in the Capitol. Reagan in the White House and Rambo in the movie houses - that's us, and our increasing intolerance of every alternative lifeway that impinges on what we take to be the American way.

The Indians ought to be crucial to our history, and especially to our early history, as exemplars of such alternative lifeways and of the incapacity of any single culture to command the continent, or even its eastern seaboard. But exactly on that account, the instance of the Indians must be disdained, or denied. In a nation obsessed with the Cold War and indifferent to irony, we can only apprehend the Indians as un-American.

Neal Salisbury's affirmation, here, of the indispensibility of the Indians to a comprehension of the contours of colonial history would be indicative enough of the ways that there would be to confront the Native American story conscientiously, if only there were a will. But I simply do not see the signs of such a will. His brilliant book, Manitou and Providence, is more suggestive still, and I would quite agree with the blurb on the back of the book jacket by James Axtell that it is "the perfect introduction to American history." But I would hate to see Neal counting on getting rich real quick on the

returns from his perfect introduction, because it seems clear to me that his colleagues in American history are not going to adopt it in droves. They will go right on using textbooks that, as he says at the outset of his paper, sum up the place of Native Americans in two or three succinct sentences and then get on to the European story that really concerns them.

In his essay here, Salisbury bids us take Indians and Europeans equally seriously. He reminds us that, at the outset of the European invasion, Native American and European societies were considerably more similar than different. Indians too were torn by "tensions between the local, the particular, and the traditional on one hand, and dynamic, larger-scale forces for change on the other." Renaissance and Reformation Europeans were also for the most part "peasants living at the level of subsistence, oriented toward kin and local communities, exchanging goods through barter, and believing in a wide range of sources of supernatural power."

Indeed, I think Salisbury could go even further than he does in this regard. He is at such pains to point out - properly, to be sure - that Western Europe had expansive elements which North America did not that he gives insufficient emphasis, I suspect, to the extent of the conflict this disparity entailed on the Europeans themselves. The existence of these dynamic classes of religious, political, and economic reformers in the Old World did differentiate most Western European culture from most Indians. There were, if you will, enormous numbers of "Indians" in Europe even before some most adventuresome and aggressive Europeans found Indians in America. The endless diatribes against idleness in colonial New England, the repeated denunciations

of laziness in the early South, the recurrent admonitions to industry in the emerging Middle Colonies, all show the persistence of that "Indian" aspect of the underlying European populations clear through the 17th century, even in the most modernizing of European outposts. By the same token, the centrality of the promise of effortless abundance and natural bounty in the promotional publications of so many of the early settlements argues that the authors of those works took the measure of the European masses and concluded that the way to address them where they lived was to provide a prospect of indolent ease and affluence without labor.

If Salisbury's paper asks thus that we set the Indians on the same descriptive plane as the Europeans, and if even that is asking more than most colonial historians are likely to grant, Salisbury's book itself asks still more. It asks not merely that we admit the Indians to our tale but also that we submit our proud sense of ourselves to Indian judgements by Indian standards. If only implicitly, Manitou and Providence presents a rebuke to Western pride and a call to a deeper knowledge of ourselves than our own self-congratulatory criteria can afford. And I simply do not see any notable disposition among us to chastise our imperial arrogance or any remarkable readiness in our midst to seek more serious self-knowledge. If anything, I see a resurgent chauvinism among the textbook publishers and the school boards which buy their product.

If there were any readiness to reckon with the record of treachery and violence which Salisbury demonstrates dominated English dealings with the Indians in Manitou and Providence, or even any readiness to accord real consideration to the Indian context of early

English conduct which Salisbury provides so splendidly in his paper, I could imagine all sorts of openings for reconception of the conventional curriculum, redesign of syllabi, and remaking of lesson plans.

I would not, I think, drift off in the direction Salisbury goes toward the end of his presentation here. I would not put as much weight as he does on the fur trade and its centrality to the early colonial economy, even though I would concede the historical validity of his emphasis. I would be wary of allowing such importance to such a truth solely because its power to engage students today seems to me so minimal. For all the decisive significance of the fur trade in its day, and for all the length of that day, the expiration of the influence of that commerce leaves us, in Salisbury's later pages, with a kind of antiquarian diplomatic history of a peculiarly bewildering and outdated sort.

I would go a different way, one that is always at least implicit and often quite explicit in Salisbury's work, to which I would only give more overweening emphasis. At considerable cost in balance, proportion, and context - a cost I suspect many of you might not be willing to pay - I would try to heighten and develop vividly the diverging lifeways of the Indians and the English.

I would recur, for example, to the issue of work, and to the colonists' outrage at what they took to be Indian indolence but which Salisbury and others have shown to be very much more intricate food cycles based on very much more variegated work routines than anything the Europeans allowed themselves. I would do this in some degree because the English affirmation of unremitting labor for its own sake,

as a sign of virtue and perhaps even of salvation, looms ever loonier by contemporary American standards, and the Indian aversion to such steady application of noses to grindstones ever more appealing. I would do so in some degree too because the pertinence of such issues of labor and leisure today just might be powerful enough to engage our students in the colonial confrontation of values in ways which go beyond accustomed assignments of merit and demerit. It just might be possible, in 1985, to reopen a range of choices made several centuries ago, and closed off ever since.

And beyond such glimmering possibilities of getting through to students, I would take up the topic of work because it is emblematic of an entire panoply of primal choices. In taking it up on such terms, I would stress the cultural cleavage between Indian priority on what Salisbury calls "minimal labor" and European insistence on incessant industry. I would emphasize the cultural chasm between Indian embrace of "natural" rhythms of great variety and European tendencies toward an "artificial" flattening of the food and work cycles. In this I would draw on William Cronon's wondrous showing of the ways in which Indian work reflected a Native American predilection for patchwork diversity and complexity while European labor represented a Western propensity for geometric repetitiveness, simplicity, and abstraction, but I would draw as well on a host of accounts of Old World cultures in the early modern era which have traced identical tendencies to concentration and mechanical simplification that would deepen the contrast with Indian ways. I think of studies such as E.P. Thompson's on the emerging English sense of time and work-discipline, Henry Glassie's on the arithmetic

repetitiveness of middle Virginia folk housing, and several demographic historians' on the smoothing of traditionally seasonal marriage and conception cycles.

I would attempt, too, to dramatize this Western proclivity for monoculture, and contrast it with the Indian predilection for a more diversified economic round, by elaborating the ways in which Cronon has shown that monocultural crop concentration encouraged its own irritations and catastrophes, exposing colonial fields to plant and animal infestations unknown to the Indians. I would try to epitomize the consequences of European simplification of a prior Indian perpetuation of ecological complexity not just by pointing to the pestiferous proliferation of some species and the fatal blighting of others but also by calling my students' attention to the appearance for the first time in the New World of such creatures as the black fly, the gray rat, the house mouse, and the cockroach.

In much the same way that I would seek to shake my students' certitude of Western superiority in workways by beginning with the case of the cockroach, I would also aim to alter their assumption of the settlers' benignity in social relations by starting from Salisbury's account of the diplomatic context of our first Thanksgiving. For in Manitou and Providence Salisbury shows quite incontrovertibly that even when desperation for their own survival drew the Plymouth colonists to conclude a treaty with the Indians, after months of maintaining an armed apartness, that compact itself served essentially to express the Pilgrims' incapacity for parity and insistence on sovereignty in their dealings with the natives. Though a few provisions of the agreement did apply equally to both sides,

several others obtained only against the Indians. Even in a compact which was the closest the Pilgrims ever came to equitable relations with their neighbors, the invaders still regarded their nexus with the natives less as a matter of "alliance and friendship between equals" than as an affair of "submission by one party to the domination of the other."

Starting from Salisbury's close examination of the clauses of the treaty, and from the adamant English demand for mastery which it reveals, I would move to develop a second vast divide between European colonial culture and Indian ways: the settlers' disposition to deal with others in a framework of dominance and submission, and the natives' preference for relations of reciprocity. Following Salisbury, I would work through the ramifications of this elemental antithesis in the kinship patterns and practices of the European and Indian cultures, in their conceptions of political authority, in their conduct of relations with other communities, and even in their traffic with the supernatural. And following others such as Cronon and Calvin Martin, I would suggest that the same discrepancy between dominion and reciprocity colored even the divergent ways in which these peoples imposed themselves upon the flora and fauna of their common habitat.

I would want my students to wonder, and worry, why Indians were able to go to war with one another without seeking the utter destruction of their rivals, while colonists could only conceive their wars with the Indians as crusades to exterminate the enemy, or why Indians could make allowance for the moral and religious differences between divergent communities while colonists could only treat them in terms of absolutes, or why Indians parents could indulge their

children lovingly while puritan patriarchs could only constrain and crush theirs.

In other words, I would want my students to learn about the Indians less to comprehend colonial history than to learn about themselves. For they are the heirs of those puritans and cavaliers and their predilections for abstraction, homogenization, and order rather than natural diversity and disarray, for conquest rather than coexistence, for control rather than reciprocity. Carl Sauer spoke of them as well as their colonial forebears when he said they still could not tell "the difference between yield and loot."

But before I launched into either of these cosmic contrasts - these ethical assaults on the sort of people we are and the sorts of priorities we have and the sorts of assumptions we make - I would spend some time at the commencement of the course tracing the devastating impact of European diseases upon the Indians. I would do so without even seeking the intricate intertwinings of biology and culture which recent scholarship such as Cronon's demonstrates. I would simply present the appalling evidence.

I suspect students would find such figures disturbing, unsettling, even moving, especially because they would seem "objective" and devoid of any obvious ethical dimension. At the same time, I suspect that such a flat, factual recital of the demographic record could open out fairly readily onto powerful issues of the cost of culture contact and the unintended and unimagined perils of bringing higher "civilizations" to benighted "savages." And I suspect, too, that such issues might be made as pertinent to today's mighty American empire as to 17th century England's puny one.

But even as I suspect that the demographic disaster visited upon the Indians by the coming of the Europeans would afford an emotional opening that a more directly didactic approach might fail to produce, my very suspicion of the necessity for immense circumspection discomfits me. And even as I suppose the story of disease and demographic decline a suitably circumspect beginning, it brings me back to my initial despair. For the "strategies of accommodation" that Salisbury says enabled the Indians "to survive as communities and to retain their distinctive identities and traditions" were strategies which were, as Salisbury concedes in his very next breath, designed only to compensate catastrophe for Indians "enveloped by the agrarian-commercial society of the newcomers."

And that in turn brings back to mind the extent to which Indian history in our colonial era is a history of pain and defeat and death and of the pain of adaptation to defeat and death. I fear that we will not be able to understand such a history - or care - until we experience a similar loss, to the Russians or the Japanese or the Brazilians, in the 20th century or the 21st or the 22nd, or whenever.

Indeed, I fear that we may not understand even then. For surely we have experienced just such a defeat in our own lifetime, in southeast Asia, and yet we bend our best efforts as a nation, today, to denying that dark knowledge. And more than that. The great preponderance of us, in this society of ethnics and immigrants, have parents or grandparents or great-great-grandparents who endured an even deeper loss, of almost everything ingredient in their ancestral cultures, yet to this very day we, their descendants, dare not reckon the cost, lest by questioning what they gained and lost we imperil our

own Americanism or call attention to our own tainted claims to legitimate participation in the national culture.

In other societies, the experience of loss has been accepted as altogether ordinary. In some, it has even inspired epic effusions, remarkable triumphs of artistry and of the spirit over such ineluctability of loss. The great epic of Great Britain celebrates King Arthur and the decay of Camelot. The great epic of France sings of Roland and his dying blast upon his horn. The great epic of the ancient Romans indeed identifies itself with Aeneas and the vanquished Trojan antagonists of the wily Odysseus. In all of these noble expressions of the Western spirit, there is a recognition of man's fate. But in American culture, there is a stubborn refusal of such recognition, an insistent belief that we can somehow set ourselves above that inevitable, invincible destiny of defeat, outside history. We cannot even come to terms with a minor military setback, let alone with the human condition. And until we can, we will never make our peace with the Indians, or make any compelling place for them in our history.

References

- William Cronon Changes in the Land: Indians, Colonists and the Ecology of New England (New York, 1983)
- Henry Glassie Folk housing in middle Virginia (Knoxville, University of Tennessee Press, 1975)
- Calvin Martin Keepers of the Game: Indian - Animal Relationships and the Fur Trade (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1978)
- Neal Salisbury Manitou and Providence: Indians, Europeans and the Making of New England, 1500-1643 (New York, 1982)
- E.P. Thompson The Making of the English Working Class (London, 1963)

As will be evident in my remarks, I am more than a little dubious that Indians can be incorporated into conventional early American history courses on any substantial scale. But insofar as I think such courses can be created in ways that would be valuable and might have some prospect of success, I would see them centered on

THE COLLISION OF CULTURES IN EARLY AMERICA

Toward that endeavor, I offer less a syllabus than a bit of a bibliography. I find especially suggestive among works on Indians the writings of James Axtell, William Cronon, Cornelius Jaenen, Francis Jennings, James Ronda, Neal Salisbury, Alden Vaughan and Daniel Richter, and Gene Waddell, on such subjects as food cycles, ecological adaptations, political organization, comparative conversions, and the like. But my bibliography might be most useful if I emphasized other cultures in the early American melange.

- Archdeacon, Thomas. New York City, 1664-1710; conquest and change.
Ithaca, 1976.
- Breen, Timothy. Puritans and Adventurers: change and persistence
in early America. New York, 1980.
- Bressler, Leo. "Agriculture among the Germans in Pennsylvania during
the Eighteenth Century," Pennsylvania History 22 (1955), 102-33.
- Drinnon, Richard. Facing West: The metaphysics of Indian-hating and
empire building. Minneapolis, 1980.
- Dunn, Richard. Sugar and Slaves; the rise of the planter class in
the English West Indies, 1624-1713. Chapel Hill, 1972.
- Gagliardo, John. "Germans and Agriculture in Colonial Pennsylvania,"
Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography 83 (1959).
- Glassie, Henry. Pattern in the Material folk culture of the
Eastern United States. Philadelphia, 1968.
- Horowitz, Donald. "Color Differentiation in the American Systems of
Slavery," Journal of Interdisciplinary History 3 (1973), 509-42.
- Jordan, Winthrop. White over Black: American attitudes toward the
Negro, 1550-1812. Chapel Hill, 1968.
- Kenney, Alice. "Private Worlds in the Middle Colonies: An
Introduction to Human Tradition in American History," New York
History 51 (1970), 5-31.
- Klein, Herbert. Slavery in the Americas; a comparative study of
Virginia and Cuba. Chicago, 1967.
- Lemon, James. The best poor man's country: A geographical study
of early southeastern Pennsylvania. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins
Press, 1972.
- Lemon, James. "The Agricultural Practices of National Groups in

Eighteenth-Century Southeastern Pennsylvania," Geographical Review 56 (1966), 467-96.

Levy, Barry. "The Birth of the 'Modern Family' in Early America: Quaker and Anglican Families in the Delaware Valley, Pennsylvania, 1681-1750." in Michael Zuckerman, ed. Friends and Neighbors; group life in America's first plural Society. Philadelphia, 1982.

McDonald, Forrest and Ellen. "The Ethnic Origins of the American People, 1790," William and Mary Quarterly, 3rd ser., 37 (1980), 179-99.

McDonald, Forrest and McWhiney, Grady. "The Antebellum Southern Herdsman: A Reinterpretation." Journal of Southern History 41 (1975), 147-66.

Moller, Herbert. "Sex Composition and Correlated Culture Patterns of Colonial America," William and Mary Quarterly, 3rd ser., 2 (1945), 113-53.

Mullin, Gerald. Flight and Rebellion; slave resistance in eighteenth-century Virginia. New York, 1972.

Nash, Gary. Red, white, and black: the peoples of Early America. Englewood Cliffs, NJ, 1974.

Peckham, Howard Henry and Charles Gibson, ed. Attitudes of the Colonial Powers toward the American Indians. Salt Lake City, 1969.

Rothermund, Dietmar. The layman's progress; religious and political experience in colonial Pennsylvania, 1740-1770. Philadelphia, 1962.

Shryock, Richard. "British v. German Traditions in Colonial Agriculture," Mississippi Valley Historical Review 26 (1939), 39-54.

- Takaki, Ronald. Iron Cages: race and culture in nineteenth-century America. New York, 1979.
- Walzer, Michael. "Puritanism as a Revolutionary Ideology," History and Theory 3 (1961), 59-90.
- Wolf, Stephanie Gravman. Urban Village: population, community and family structure in Germantown, Pennsylvania, 1683-1800. Princeton, 1976.
- Zuckerman, Michael. "Pilgrims in the Wilderness: Community, Modernity, and the Maypole at Merry Mount," New England Quarterly 50 (1977), 255-77.

714-21-10

American Expansion in the 19th Century: A Second Look

R. David Edmunds

Texas Christian University

As an Indian historian, I have never questioned the merit of exploring Indian history for its own sake. Indeed, I believe that most Indian historians would argue that their discipline stands on its own: that there is an intrinsic value in the study of Indian people, regardless of their relationship to the "mainstream of American history." Yet for too long Indian history, black history, and even women's history have been regarded as esoteric sideshows only vaguely related to the primary focus of historical development in the United States. Indians, in particular, have served as "barriers" to the advancing frontier: historical foils to be overcome by hardy frontiersmen intent upon spreading the American mission from coast to coast.

Like many members of the audience, I also teach beginning American history surveys to large classes of undergraduates (primarily freshmen and sophomores), and like other survey teachers I am constantly distressed over my inability to incorporate all pertinent facets of American history into a two semester (six hours of academic credit) survey of the subject. I know that I give some important subjects short shrift, yet I'm also certain that it is functionally impossible to present a six hour survey of American history that will completely satisfy every interest.

I may be a cynic, but given the nature of graduate training in

most history departments, I rather doubt that most teachers of American history surveys will restructure their courses to focus upon the Indian-white experience as the central theme of American expansion. Yet I would strongly argue that there are many facets of the Indian-white experience that offer very valuable insights into the nature of American expansion and the growth of American institutions and ideas in the nineteenth century. Any survey of American history which does not incorporate some of these materials is missing an important part of the American experience. Therefore, I would like to focus my remarks upon two closely related, but different general topics. The first is the impact of Indians upon what might be termed "the mainstream of American history:" those themes or institutions which are discussed in almost all surveys, but which are sometimes seen as having little, if any, relationship to Indians. The final part of this paper will address some new or different interpretations of events in which even the most conservative apologists for white expansion would agree that Indian people played dominant roles.

* * * * *

As the American nation expanded westward, Indian people played a major role in conflicts between local, state, and federal governments. Many of these clashes reflect a theme familiar to most American historians: the federal government's inability to maintain effective control over its western citizens. Between 1795 and 1809 federal officials signed seventeen treaties with the tribes of Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, and Michigan, but the agreements were honored more in their violation than in their adherence. Imbued with a sense of their own self-righteousness, American frontiersmen ignored the treaty

regulations and regularly crossed over on to Indian lands to hunt, trap, or establish homesteads. Although federal officials in Ohio and Indiana made desultory attempts to protect Indian interests, they could not stop the tide of American aggrandizement. White trespass upon Indian lands reached such proportions that in 1808 William Henry Harrison, the Governor of Indiana Territory complained:

The people of Kentucky...make a constant practice of crossing over into Indian lands...to kill deer, bear, and buffaloe [sic]...One hunter will destroy more game than five of the common Indians,

and, in response to a more serious problem, Harrison added "a great many of the Inhabitants of the Fronteers [sic] consider the murdering of the Indians in the highest degree meritorious." Federal lawmakers in Washington might be willing to differentiate between Indian and white lands, but for many frontiersmen, the western territories held a vast cornucopia to be exploited to their own advantage. Indians were seen as part of a wilderness impediment which either had to be removed, or converted to "civilization."¹

Recently, more sophisticated inquiry has attempted to investigate the varied relationship of different western socio-economic groups with the tribesmen. Focusing his research upon northern California and Oregon, Steven Novak has been able to demonstrate marked differences between the attitudes of farmers and miners toward Indians. Novak argues, rather convincingly, that by the middle decades of the nineteenth century most permanent settlers (farmers) in Oregon were interested in promoting peace and stability between the white and Indian populations. According to federal officials familiar with inter-racial relations in the region, the farmers knew that:

their future prospects depend chiefly upon the prosperity of the country, the increase of emigration, enhancement in the value of property, security of life, (and the) opening of new facilities for their products.

Obviously, warfare between Indians and whites would disrupt such tranquility and impede the "progress" of the region as whites defined such a condition.²

If farmers or permanent settlers attempted to foster good relations between the races, who was responsible for much of the bloodshed that seemed to permeate inter-racial contacts on the American frontier? Novak places much of the blame upon miners and other frontiersmen whose economic activities made them more transient. He discusses the "boom or bust" economic cycles of frontier miners and indicates that prospectors often were eager for the maximum exploitation of mineral resources, regardless of the long term impact of such exploitation upon other resources in the region. They had little interest in long-term development, but preferred to "make their stake" and then retire to more comfortable surroundings. Many miners and other transients viewed Indians as impediments to their success, and they were quite willing to eliminate them. Moreover, since many miners and other transient laborers often were unemployed, they sometimes welcomed the opportunity to serve in militia or para-military volunteer units which were formed to suppress Indian "uprisings." Of course such service did not go unrewarded, and "volunteers" drew rations and a daily wage at government expense. Such wages hardly matched the riches of a "bonanza" strike in the gold fields, but for destitute laborers, payment for military services offered ready cash.³

Novak argues that much of the violence perpetrated upon Indians emanated from such socio-economic groups, and that they represented only a minority of the frontier's white population. Yet they comprised such a volatile and violent element that they were able to intimidate the "silent majority" who often sympathized with the Indians, but who were too frightened to take any action in their behalf. In addition, once widespread Indian-white warfare was initiated, Indian retaliation often failed to discriminate between the various segments of the white community, and the two sides became polarized. In defense of their farms and families, white farmers then joined the conflict, and the results usually were disastrous for the tribesmen.⁴

Of course clashes between Indians and lawless frontiersmen were not unique to northern California and Oregon. In 1774 Dunmore's War had been precipitated when frontier riffraff murdered innocent Shawnees and Delawares along the Ohio. Almost sixty years later on May 14, 1832, the Black Hawk War probably would have terminated without bloodshed if the drunken militia "commanded" by Major Isaiah Stillman had not attacked Black Hawk's envoys as the old Sac war chief prepared to surrender. The resulting Battle of Stillman's Run ended any chance for the hapless Sacs and Foxes to peacefully withdraw back into Iowa. On November 28, 1864, ill-trained and drunken militia were also responsible for the slaughter of over one hundred and fifty Cheyennes and Arapahoes at Sand Creek, in southeastern Colorado. Ironically, this assault was led by John M. Chivington, a colonel of the Colorado Volunteers and a lay-preacher and presiding elder in the First Methodist Episcopal Church of Denver. Many of Chivington's followers

were miners lured west by the Colorado gold rush of the late 1850s. Illegal trespass by miners onto Indian lands in the Black Hills also triggered the last of the Sioux Wars, culminating in Custer's defeat at the Battle of the Little Big Horn. In retrospect, if Indian lands held valuable resources, those treasures were exploited. Although the federal government might guarantee the inviolability of Indian real estate, such promises often were broken. The consequences of such situations should hold a profound message for those tribal communities which still hold valuable mineral or water resources in the twentieth century.⁵

Conflicts between Indians and whites over Indian lands also offer some interesting insights into the entrepreneurial values of the Jacksonians. By the 1820s the older adherence to a planned organic economic system was under attack from emerging entrepreneurs who believed that "the powdered wig set" were controlling the nation's resources for their own benefit. After the adoption of the cotton gin spread cotton production across the Gulf Plains, Indian lands in the region became the focus of local land speculators. Their complaint was not that the federal government had failed to purchase Indian land holdings (indeed, by the 1820s much of the former tribal holdings already were in the public domain), but that the government did not immediately buy all the Indian lands remaining within their respective states and send the tribes packing across the Mississippi.

In contrast, many officials in Washington, as exemplified by President John Quincy Adams, still gave at least lip service to the civilization programs that had been in force since the beginning of the century. In theory the Indians were to adopt white life styles

and be assimilated into American society. In actuality, Adams also may have favored some type of removal program, but he championed carefully planned and legalistic procedures through which the changing status of the Indians and their tenure on tribal lands could be delineated.

Any hesitancy and long term planning was unacceptable to local expansionists led by Governor George M. Troup of Georgia. In 1825 agents employed by the federal government, but under Troup's influence, negotiated the Treaty of Indian Springs with a faction representing a minority of the Creek confederacy. After the treaty was ratified by the Senate in March 1825, the tribe executed William McIntosh, the leader of the treaty faction. Troup threatened to overrun Creek lands with the Georgia militia, and federal officials interceded, nullifying the Treaty of Indian Springs, but signing the Treaty of Washington with the Creeks one year later. The new treaty also called for the cession of Creek lands in Georgia (already a fait accompli, since settlers had moved into the region), but the terms were more favorable for the Indians and the federal government promised to guarantee the remaining Creek lands in Alabama. In theory at least, federal officials had interceded to partially protect Indian interests from expansionists at the state and local levels of government.⁶

Whether the Adams regime would (or could) have honored its promises remains doubtful, but in 1828 Andrew Jackson was elected to the presidency and the spokesman for the rising class of entrepreneurs was in the White House. Jackson's Indian policy is a matter of record, and it is not surprising that the Indian Removal Bill was

passed during his first term in office. All American historians are familiar with the supreme court cases which were adjudicated during his presidency, and both *Cherokee Nation v. Georgia* and *Worcester v. Georgia* remain landmark cases in constitutional history courses. Both cases also reflect the conflict in philosophies of government and economic theory between the Jacksonians and the adherents to the older, more organic interpretation of society.⁷

The surrender of valuable land was not the only economic asset that Indians provided on the American frontier. By the third decade of the nineteenth century almost all of the tribes east of the Great Plains were enmeshed in the American economic system, and were dependent upon traders for many of the necessities of life. At the same time, because of their annuity payments and other sources of income, they provided an important source of revenue for frontier merchants and traders. Only recently have historians begun to explore the nature of this relationship, and their inquiries have revealed two rather interesting phenomena. First, the magnitude and importance of the Indian community to the income of white entrepreneurs often has been underestimated. The Indian trade, if properly manipulated, was so lucrative that frontier merchants vied among themselves to gain a greater share of it. In 1821 John Crowell resigned his seat as the lone congressman from the state of Georgia to accept an appointment as agent to the Creek Indians. He promptly issued trading licenses to members of his family and Crowell and his kinsmen amassed a fortune.⁸

Because most tribesmen were illiterate, there were few checks and balances upon the traders' practice of selling the Indians goods upon credit, then padding the accounts when the traders demanded payment.

Sometimes the fraud reached phenomenal proportions. A recent study indicates that in 1836 several bands of Potawatomis in frontier Indiana were alleged to have accumulated debts of over \$160,000. A federal investigation subsequently proved that almost 50% of the claims were completely fraudulent, but in many other instances the funds were deducted from the Indians' annuities. If the Age of Jackson was a time of economic opportunism, Indian people and their resources played a significant role in the development of the economy in the west.⁹

Not surprisingly, many of these frontier merchants exercised considerable influence over the tribes. Indian traders such as the Ewing brothers of Indiana, or the Kinzie-Forsyth partnership at Chicago dabbled in tribal politics, and even worked to prevent the removal of tribes which allegedly owed them money. In 1837 George Ewing warned government Indian agents that Potawatomis in northern Indiana would never remove unless he was paid what he claimed the Indians owed to him. In some instances federal agents treating for the purchase of tribal lands were forced to work through the traders to ensure the success of their negotiations. Ironically, the traders then often removed west with the tribesmen, following the sources of their revenue across the Mississippi.¹⁰

Racism is a theme which permeates American history in the nineteenth century, and although most studies of racism during this period focus upon black-white relations, American attitudes toward Indians also offer some interesting insights into the broad scope of American prejudice. Throughout the last century federal officials assured Indian people that they would be readily accepted into the

American mainstream if they would relinquish their "savage" lifestyle. Yet subsequent actions by both American citizens and their government illustrate that such promises were rank hypocrisy.

Events in the Old Northwest during the decades that followed the War of 1812 indicate that Americans often refused to accept Indians, even if the latter had adopted many tenets of European civilization. In 1827 Commissioner of Indian Affairs Thomas McKenney travelled among the tribes of this region, and later reported to officials in Washington that the Indians should be removed beyond the Mississippi because they had rejected government attempts to transform them into small yeoman farmers. McKenney charged that the tribesmen still followed the lifestyle of their fathers: "They catch fish, and plant patches of corn; dance, hunt, and get drunk when they can get liquor, fight, and often starve."¹¹ Yet McKenney and many other Americans failed to realize that many Indians in the region had made great changes from the traditional cultures of their forefathers. Indeed, many of the Indians in Michigan, Illinois, and Indiana had adopted a lifestyle that resembled those whites with whom they had the closest contact: the Creole French whose ancestors had settled in the Old Northwest during the previous century. Like the Indians, many of the Creoles also continued to hunt, trap, and fish; and like the Indians they too were seen as improvident and even "uncivilized" by Anglo-Americans. American officials newly arrived at Vincennes, Indiana, described the Creole population as "a rabble whose appearance caused us to doubt whether we had not actually landed among the savages themselves," and at Detroit Lewis Cass charged that:

As traders...they spend one half of the year in labor, want, and exposure, and the other in

indolence and amusements. Associated with the Indians, they contracted their manners, and gained their confidence. As a necessary consequence their farms were neglected...¹²

Yet if American observers had been less biased, they would have noted that by the 1820s many Miami, Potawatomi, and other tribesmen were active in the fur trade, working as porters or laborers, or selling merchandise to both whites and Indians. In 1816, when Indiana entered the union, the wealthiest man in the state was reputed to be Jean Baptiste Richardville, a mixed-blood Miami trader. Of course not all the Indians were as acculturated as Richardville, or the Vieux family among the Potawatomis, but neither were they living within the culture of their forefathers. Indeed, most of the tribesmen in the region already had adopted many tenets of European culture, but from the American perspective it was the wrong culture: the Creole French. Ironically, American frontiersmen were almost as biased in their attitudes toward the Creoles as they were toward the Indians. And since the tribesmen had acculturated toward the wrong ethnic group, American observers refused to admit that they made any significant changes. They were not yeoman farmers, so they should be removed to the west.¹³

If the Indians in the Old Northwest were removed because federal agents refused to acknowledge their acculturation, no such excuse can be offered in defense of those officials who forced the tribes from their lands in Georgia, Alabama, and Mississippi. Potawatomis, Ottawas, and Miamis might have adopted surnames such as Le Clair, Beaubien, or Godfroy, but among the Cherokees and Creeks, Scotch-Irish or English surnames were common. Of all the southeastern peoples, the Cherokees probably were most acculturated. Recent scholarship

indicates that the Cherokees may not have subscribed to the Anglo-American value system to the extent that earlier historians suggest, but by all accounts they had adopted many tenets of American culture, and in many ways they emulated the ways of their white neighbors. In retrospect, the Cherokees' designation as one of the "Five Civilized Tribes" by ethnocentric whites is tacit admission that the latter believed the Cherokees had accepted the basic core of 19th century American civilization.¹⁴

Yet the Cherokees' "civilization" afforded them little protection. After gold was discovered on Cherokee lands in Georgia, white Americans ignored the significant "progress" (as whites defined the term) the tribe had made and overran their territories. The history of the usurpation of Cherokee lands and the Indians' subsequent removal is a familiar story which needs no re-telling, but it remains an excellent example of American racism and the hypocrisy of federal Indian policy. Regardless of how "civilized" the Cherokees had become, other Americans still saw them as "Indians" and therefore not encompassed in the protection which the Constitution extended to white men.

There is an interesting footnote to the Cherokee-white relationship which illustrates that the racism shown to the tribe was not just a southern phenomenon. As most historians are aware, much of the support for the Cherokees in their fight against removal came from politicians and humanitarians in New England. Whether this opposition to Indian removal emanated from a sincere concern over the Indians, or from political opposition directed against Andrew Jackson remains uncertain. In addition, some opponents to Cherokee removal may have

been motivated by their opposition to the tribe extending slavery into the west. Yet during the crisis of the removal years the New England press was particularly vociferous in its denunciation of the South's treatment of the Indians.

In contrast many New Englanders were much less willing to accept Cherokees, or less acculturated tribesmen into their midst. During the 1820s several Cherokee students enrolled in a mission school for "foreign" students at Cornwall, Connecticut. Although the students performed admirably in their classes, two young Cherokee men became betrothed to two young white women from the Cornwall community. The marriage of the first couple (John Ridge and Sarah Northrup) engendered such an aftershock of prejudice that the school's board of directors forbade its students to associate with eligible women from the Cornwall community. The second suitor, Elias Boudinot, temporarily returned to Georgia, but when he returned in 1826 to claim his bride, Harriet Gold, the community erupted in a frenzy of racism. Former friends of the bride dressed in black crape to signify her spiritual death, and she was burned in effigy on the village green (her own brother ignited the fire). Threats of physical violence were made toward the couple and they were forced to hide for their safety. The marriage finally took place, but following the ceremony an armed guard accompanied the couple as far as Washington, D.C., as the newlyweds fled to the Cherokees for sanctuary. Needless to say, the Cherokees sent no more students to the Cornwall Academy.¹⁵

Although much has been written about the hardships suffered by the Indians during the removal process, there is another facet of this forced relocation which is often overlooked: the role played by the

Indians in bringing changes to the trans-Mississippi west. Ironically, those eastern tribes seeking new homes on the fringe of the Great Plains became catalysts for transmitting the very socio-economic system they were fleeing. And their entrance onto lands previously dominated by tribes indigenous to the region posed a substantial threat to these western peoples. In many cases the western tribes opposed the resettlement of eastern Indians, and bitter conflicts emerged over hunting lands in Iowa, Kansas, Missouri and Oklahoma.

Not suprisingly, the emigrant warriors usually emerged as victors in these conflicts. Although the popular press has touted the military skill of the plains tribes, the eastern warriors had experienced over a century of intertribal conflicts generated by European and American confrontations. Cherokee, Shawnee, and Delaware warriors steadily pushed the Osages from their lands in Missouri and Arkansas, while tribesmen from the Old Northwest usurped the hunting lands of several plains tribes in Kansas.¹⁶ Potawatomi and Sac tribesmen may have feigned pleas to federal officials, asking for protection against the Sioux, but when the two sides met on the prairie, the newcomers to western Iowa successfully defended themselves. In June 1853, a party of mounted Potawatomis rode to the assistance of a village of Pawnees who had been attacked by a large force of Cheyennes, Arapahoes, Sioux, and Kiowas. Although the plains warriors swooped down on the newcomers, the Potawatomis formed ranks, and firing from horseback, easily repulsed the Cheyennes and their allies. Seeking revenge, one year later another large war party of almost 700 plains warriors attacked 200 Sacs and Foxes who were

hunting buffalo on the Smoky Hill River in Kansas. In this instance the Sacs and Foxes dismounted, again formed ranks, and repulsed their enemies' repeated charges. When the plains Indians withdrew, they had suffered over 100 casualties. The Sacs and Foxes lost only a handful of warriors.¹⁷

In Oklahoma, the occupation of the eastern part of the state by the Five Southern ("Civilized") Tribes created an oasis of relative sophistication in an area not known for its gentility. Although full-blooded traditionalists may have moved west hoping to recreate their old way of life free from American influence, the acculturated mixed-bloods who had dominated the tribes in their ancestral homelands reasserted their hegemony in Oklahoma. Centered around such communities as Atoka, Tahlequah, Muskogee, and Tishomingo, the Choctaws, Cherokees, Creeks, Chickasaws, and later the Seminoles carved out plantations, planted fields of cotton, and erected fine ante-bellum homes. Indeed, their adherence to southern values was so pervasive that during the Civil War so many fought for the Confederate cause that they formed an effective barrier against any Union expeditions toward Texas. In turn, their presence in Oklahoma freed troops from Texas from defending their homes and enabled them to assist Confederate forces in other theatres of the conflict.¹⁸

The emigrant tribes also made significant achievements in other fields. The Cherokees established perhaps the best rural school system west of the Mississippi during the ante-bellum period. Financed by the tribal government, both seminaries and finishing schools sent their graduates back into the eastern states where they attended college, then returned to help build the Cherokee Nation.¹⁹

Further to the north, in Kansas, acculturated Potawatomis at St. Mary's Mission operated ferries across the Kansas River and sold produce and other supplies to settlers traveling west to Colorado or California. White emigrant diaries expressed considerable surprise at these Indians' sophistication and often commented upon the prosperity of their villages. In 1854 the Potawatomis purchased and operated the first McCormick's Reaper utilized in Kansas, and when dignitaries visited their mission they entertained them with band concerts and piano recitals. By any standard, these Indian emigrants did as much to "tame" the frontier as did many white pioneers.²⁰

The economic success of the Five Southern Tribes created another phenomenon that also proliferated in Oklahoma: the continued inter-marriage of Indians and whites. Since all members of the tribe or their spouses were eligible to claim potential farmland within tribal territories, many white men married Indian women. Such marriages were celebrated for other reasons. Most frontier whites in Oklahoma were from relatively low socio-economic classes. When these men married the often more sophisticated, more financially secure Indian women, they were marrying "up." It is not surprising that so many modern Oklahomans claim Cherokee grandmothers. Maternal ancestors such as these Cherokee women were proud additions to white families struggling for upward social-economic mobility.

There is another facet of the American experience in the nineteenth century in which Indians played an important, if sometimes unwitting role: the attempt by a new nation to establish its own intellectual identity. In this instance, Americans used idealized or popular conceptions of Indians as counterpoints to define their own

"progress," or as foils to rationalize American expansion. Indeed, the "image" of the Indian which emerges during this period offers interesting insights into the intellectual life of the new nation.

As Robert Berkhofer Jr. illustrates in his volume, The White Man's Indian, the concept of the Indian as a "noble savage" did not become popular in the United States until the nineteenth century. Eager to develop a national literature, authors along the eastern seaboard turned to the Indian as a subject uniquely American. Since all Indians had been removed from the region, and since they associated the Indians with the past, it was easy for such writers to romanticize the tribesmen. Indian leaders such as King Philip (Metacom), Hiawatha, Tecumseh, and Pocahontas emerged from nineteenth century literature in images that were larger than life. Moreover, the depiction of Indians in heroic, if sometimes tragic terms also enhanced most Americans' self esteem, for in their victory over such champions, Americans could assure themselves that they were worthy to inherit the tribesmen's kingdom.²¹

Yet not all Americans subscribed to the "noble savage" image nor associated Indians with a glorious past. In the decades that followed the War of 1812, the United States was eager to take its rightful place among the "civilized" nations of the western world. Although many Americans asserted that they were pleased to have broken from a decadent Europe, others seemed uncertain of the nation's status, and sought reassurance that American society had come of age. For Americans unsure of their standing, the "triumph" of American "civilization" over the Indian population of the United States seemed to provide one favorable measure of their country's progress. Not

only did their "republican virtue" separate them from European corruption, but their achievements assured them that they no longer were "primitives" like the Indians. The Indians symbolized a wilderness that was being conquered, and the tribesmen's demise was indicative of the "grand drama of progress" sweeping westward across the United States.²²

American frontiersmen readily subscribed to such views, and argued that Indians were an obstacle to manifest destiny. In addition, many frontiersmen alleged that the Indians were "wasting" their lands because they refused to participate in economic activities such as agriculture, ranching, or mining: charges which reflect either the ignorance or duplicity of the frontiersmen. As James J. Rawls' recent volume, The Indians of California illustrates, American emigrants in California were adept at modifying the image of the California tribes in a manner designed to facilitate their own interests. Prior to the Mexican War, American expansionists depicted the Indians as being mistreated by the Spanish mission system, and argued that the American government had a moral obligation to liberate such "poor devils" from Mexican and Catholic oppression. Yet when California passed into American hands, the California tribesmen were first described as a ready source of labor, made "docile and tractable" by their experiences in the mission system. By the 1880s, when Americans no longer believed that they could utilize Indian workers, white Californians promulgated the image of the "sub-human diggers" as a rationale for the tribesmen's extinction.²³

Finally, the "civilization" programs fostered by the Bureau of Indian Affairs also offer some useful insights into the value system

of American society during the nineteenth century. Since many Americans continued to champion small yeomen farmers as the American ideal, federal Indian policy from the Intercourse Acts through the Dawes Act attempted to recreate Indians in the yeoman image. Moreover, these programs were fostered upon Indian men. Although Indian women often had extensive agricultural experience, they were excluded from the government's efforts. In American society agriculture was dominated by males and Indian agents had little patience with former warriors who preferred to let their wives or daughters till the soil. Because white males dominated American economic systems, Indian males were expected to adopt similar values.²⁴ Since the United States envisioned itself as a Christian nation, federal policy-makers also encouraged missionaries to proselytize the tribes. Traditional religions and other "pagan" ceremonies were discouraged as remnants of a "savage" past, and the Indians were encouraged to embrace Christianity as a litmus of their acculturation. In a similar manner, they also were encouraged to accumulate capital. In the nineteenth (and twentieth) century material wealth was (is) deemed the primary measure of success, and if Indian people wished to be accepted, they too would have to amass and horde such resources. Ironically of course, although these programs reflected American values, they did not necessarily reflect the reality of American society. By 1877 (the date of the passage of the Dawes Act) the United States already was being transformed into an industrialized society, and although the missionaries championed Christian conduct, such virtue did not permeate all sections of American society.²⁵

* * * * *

Recent scholarship has also shed new light upon several facets of American expansion with which Indians always have been associated. Perhaps the most classic of these is the interaction of Indians and white emigrants as the latter made their way west to new homes in California or Oregon. Although the popular media has always devoted considerable space to depicting wagon-trains manned by white settlers under attack by war parties of Indians, the late John Unruh's The Plains Across illustrates that such confrontations rarely occurred. In contrast, Unruh indicates that many white travelers saw few, if any Indians, and that the contacts between the two groups were more often amenable than otherwise. Early emigrants on the plains sometimes relied upon Indians for information regarding their route, and other travelers hired Indian warriors to assist them in transporting their livestock and possessions across flooded river bottoms. Indeed, during the 1840s tribesmen in Washington and Oregon carried large numbers of emigrants downstream in their canoes, even providing portage services around such hazards as the Cascades of the Columbia. In addition, Unruh points out that both sides traded briskly with one another, providing a useful interchange of commodities between the two communities. Many tribesmen did attempt to charge the emigrants to cross their lands, but given the number of game animals killed, and the timber cut by such travelers, such fees were not unreasonable.²⁶

Obviously, conflicts between Indians and whites occurred, but as Unruh points out, Indians posed a far greater threat in terms of pilferage than as perpetrators of violence. Tribesmen sometimes stole horses from the wagon train's picket line, and they often wandered through camp, pocketing items they thought were useful. Diaries kept

by emigrants are full of entries such as the following: "They (the Indians) are friendly disposed and no disposition to hostility is shown. They, however, steal all they can but as yet they have not got much from us." Another wayfarer reported back to his hometown newspaper that he believed, if given the opportunity, the Pawness could "steal a horse from under his rider."²⁷

Rumors of bloodshed were far more common than any actual loss of life. Of course such violence did occur, but in the two decades between 1840 and 1860, approximately 316,000 emigrants traveled west over the Oregon Trail. During that period the Indians killed 362 travelers. In the same decades, by their own admission, American emigrants murdered 426 Indians. Ironically, although the Great Plains are usually pictured as the scene of this violence, most lives were lost after the wagon trains had crossed through South Pass. The western segment of the journey was far more dangerous.²⁸

Indians also have been associated with American expansion and the War of 1812, but recent scholarship suggests that the Indian confederation which emerged prior to that conflict needs further examination. Traditionally, historians have attributed the movement to Tecumseh, the Shawnee war chief who traveled among the western tribes from 1809 to 1811, attempting to enlist the warriors into a political and military organization designed to defend the remaining Indian land base east of the Mississippi. In contrast, Tecumseh's brother, Tenskwatawa, the Shawnee Prophet, usually has been portrayed as a religious charlatan who rode Tecumseh's coattails to a position of minor prominence. Yet throughout American history, during periods of significant stress, Indian people traditionally have turned to

religious leaders or revitalization movements for their deliverance. Spiritual spokesmen such as Neolin, the Delaware Prophet; Handsome Lake of the Senecas; Smoholla, the Sokulk "preacher;" Wovoka of the Paiutes and others are good examples of holy men who emerged to meet their people's needs.

Two recent studies, The Shawnee Prophet, and Tecumseh and the Quest for Indian Leadership suggest that Tenskwatawa, the Shawnee Prophet, was more instrumental than Tecumseh in forging the Indian coalition in the years preceding the War of 1812. After examining all the primary materials focusing upon these events, the author has concluded that for four years, from 1805 until 1809, the religious teachings of the Shawnee Prophet were the magnet that attracted the thousands of Indians, first to Greenville, in Ohio, then to Prophetstown. Although there are extensive references to the Prophet and his movements in documents from this period, there is no mention of Tecumseh prior to April 1808, when British officials in Canada mention that "the Prophet's brother" visited Amherstburg. William Henry Harrison, Tecumseh's primary antagonist does not mention the Shawnee chief until August 1810, and then Harrison also refers to him only as "the Prophet's brother," since he evidently had not yet learned Tecumseh's name. Indeed, Tecumseh did not challenge his brother for leadership until after the Treaty of Fort Wayne (1809) which transferred extensive Indian landholdings in Indiana to the United States. The Shawnee war chief then used his brother's religious movement as the base for his ill-fated, political-military confederacy.²⁹

Both volumes suggest that white historians have championed

Tecumseh as the author of the Indian resistance movement since his concepts of political and military unity seemed more logical (by white standards) than the Prophet's religious revitalization. Yet the Prophet's doctrines had more appeal to the Indians. The biography of Tecumseh argues that Americans have idolized Tecumseh since they believe he fits their concept of the "noble savage." The volume also discusses the extensive apocrypha which have been associated with the Shawnee chief since his death.³⁰

Finally, the impact of economic expansion upon the politics, economics, and social structure of an Indian tribe is masterfully portrayed in Richard White's discussion of the Choctaws in his recently published volume, Roots of Dependency. Although White begins his analysis in the period prior to European contact and traces changes in Choctaw culture through the colonial era, much of his discussion focuses upon the impact of the American market economy upon the Choctaws during the first third of the nineteenth century. White's book is especially valuable in its discussion of the rise of mixed-blood leadership among the tribe and their role as champions of a market economy. He illustrates that many traditional Choctaw leaders were willing to remove to new lands in the west, since they believed that their traditional life-style could no longer be maintained on their ancestral lands in Mississippi. In contrast, the mixed-bloods who were proponents of white agricultural enterprises fought removal since they believed that Choctaw lands east of the Mississippi offered the potential for economic growth and the accumulation of capital.³¹

The mixed-bloods' opposition to Indian removal enabled them to

emerge as the defenders of the Choctaw homeland, and markedly increased their influence among many rank-and-file members of the tribe. Utilizing their new image as tribal patriots, the mixed-bloods then allied themselves with missionaries to encourage further changes which they believed would strengthen the tribe's ability to retain their homeland in Mississippi. Meanwhile, the Choctaws became more deeply enmeshed in the region's market economy, and the tribe eventually was overwhelmed. This brief synopsis of only a few chapters of White's volume fails to adequately portray his sophisticated analysis, but the study is a detailed and insightful investigation of the development of economic dependency in an Indian tribe. It also presents an excellent study of intra-tribal politics during the removal period.³²

* * * * *

In conclusion, Indian people had a profound impact upon the expansion of the United States in the nineteenth century. Not only did Indians influence the geographic thrust of expansion, they also shaped the relationship between American frontiersmen and their government. Moreover, Indian assets provided an economic impetus to many communities in the west. And finally, American conceptions about Indians affected the development of American ideas and attitudes during this period.

Obviously, there are other areas in which Indians shaped American expansion. As James Ronda's recent volume illustrates, Indians played a major role in the exploration of the American west, and in the post-Civil War period acculturated mixed-blood leaders in Oklahoma markedly influenced economic expansion on the south-central plains.

Moreover, the Indian-white experience in North America could be studied as part of a world-wide expansion by colonial powers throughout the nineteenth century. Yet limitations of time and space preclude the delineation of these and many other possibilities. Hopefully this paper will generate further discussion which will provide additional insights into this subject.

NOTES

1. William Henry Harrison to the Secretary of War, July 15, 1801, in Logan Esarey, ed., Messages and Letters of William Henry Harrison, 2 vols. (Indianapolis, 1922), 1, 25-31.
2. Steven J. Novak, "Dissent in Indian War: John Beeson's 'A Plea For the Indians'" (unpublished manuscript in Steven Novak's possession, Los Angeles, California, 1984). Also see Novak, "Second Seminole War" (unpublished manuscript in Novak's possession, Los Angeles, California, n.d.).
3. Novak, "Dissent in Indian War."
4. Ibid.
5. Jack M. Sosin, The Revolutionary Frontier, 1763-1783 (New York, 1967), 85-6; Anthony F. C. Wallace, Prelude to Disaster: The Course of Indian-White Relations Which Led to the Black Hawk War of 1832 (Springfield, IL, 1970), 51; Donald J. Berthrong, The Southern Cheyennes (Norman, OK, 1963) 215-23; Ralph K. Andrist, The Long Death: The Last Days of the Plains Indians (New York, 1964), 69-96; 239-300. Wilcomb Washburn's Red Man's Land--White Man's Law (New York, 1971) offers a good survey of the Indian-white conflict over land tenancy.
6. The best discussion of the struggle for control of Creek lands in Georgia and Alabama can be found in Michael D. Green's The Politics of Indian Removal: Creek Government and Society in Crisis (Lincoln, NE, 1982).
7. Mary E. Young's Redskins, Ruffleshirts, and Rednecks: Indian Allotments in Alabama and Mississippi, 1830-1860 (Norman, 1961) provides an excellent analysis of the methods through which allotted

Indian lands passed into American hands.

8. Green, The Politics of Indian Removal, 58-68.

9. R. David Edmunds, "Designing Men, Seeking a Fortune: Indian Traders and the Potawatomi Claims Payment of 1836," Indiana Magazine of History 72 (June 1981), 109-22.

10. Robert Trennert's Indian Traders on the Middle Border: The House of Ewing, 1827-1854 (Lincoln, 1981) offers an excellent case study of the impact of traders in the Middle West. Gary C. Anderson's Kinsmen of Another Kind: Dakota-White Relations in the Upper Mississippi Valley, 1650-1862 (Lincoln, 1984) discusses the impact of traders upon the Sioux in Minnesota.

11. Report by Thomas McKenney, March 22, 1830, U.S. Congress, Senate, 21st Congress, 1st Session, Senate Document 110, 2-3.

12. Adam Walker, "A Journal of Two Campaigns of the Fourth Regiment of U.S. Infantry," in Esarey, Harrison Letters, 1, 697; Cass to the Secretary of War, Main Series, Record Group 107, National Archives (M221, Roll 65, 8346-8348).

13. For an informative series of essays upon the impact of the mixed-blood community in Canada and the Great Lakes region see Jacqueline Peterson and Jennifer S. H. Brown, eds., The New Peoples: Being and Becoming Metis in North America (Lincoln, 1985).

Ethnologists define "acculturation" in different ways, but in this paper the term shall be defined as the process through which the culture of a minority (Indian) group changes to resemble the culture of a dominant (European or American) group.

14. Secondary materials on the Cherokees and the other southern tribes are so numerous that any attempt to offer limited suggestions

for further reading will be incomplete. The following are but a few of the many studies which focus upon acculturation within this tribe: Grace Steele Woodard, The Cherokees (Norman, 1963); Rennard Strickland, Fire and the Spirits; Cherokee Law From Clan to Court (Norman, 1975); Henry T. Malone, Cherokees of the Old South: A People in Transition (Athens, GA, 1956); Theda Perdue, Slavery and the Evolution of Cherokee Society (Knoxville, TN, 1979); John Finger, The Eastern Band of Cherokees, 1819-1900 (Knoxville, 1984). Also see Gary B. Nash, "The Image of the Indians in the Southern Colonial Mind," William and Mary Quarterly, 3d. Ser., 29 (April 1972), 197-230; William G. McLoughlin and Walter H. Conser, Jr., "The Cherokees in Transition: A Statistical Analysis of the Federal Cherokee Census of 1835," Journal of American History 44 (December 1977), 678-703; Mary Young, "The Cherokee Nation: Mirror of the Republic," American Quarterly 33 (Winter 1981), 503-24.

15. For details of the confrontation at Cornwall, see Ralph Gabriel, Elias Boudinot (Norman, 1941), and Theda Perdue, ed., Cherokee Editor: The Writings of Elias Boudinot (Knoxville, 1983).

16. Grant Foreman, Advancing the Frontier, 1830-1860 (Norman, 1933).

17. George Hyde, The Pawnee Indians (Norman, 1974), 235-36; William T. Hagan, The Sac and Fox Indians (Norman, 1958), 225-29.

18. Grant Foreman, The Five Civilized Tribes (Norman, 1934).

19. Devon Abbott, "Cultivating the Rose Buds: The administration of the Cherokee Female Seminary, 1846-1907" (unpublished M.A. thesis, Texas Christian University, 1984); Ida W. Tinnin, "Educational and Cultural Influences of the Cherokee

Seminaries," Chronicles of Oklahoma, 37 (Spring 1959), 59-67.

20. George Root, "Ferries in Kansas: Part Two, Continued," Kansas Historical Quarterly 3 (February 1934), 15-42; J. Neale Carman, "The Bishop East of the Rockies Views His Diocese," Ibid., 21 (Summer 1954), 81-86; Alberta Pantle, ed., "The Connecticut Kansas Colony: Letters of Charles B. Lines to the New Haven Daily Palladium," Ibid., 22 (Spring 1956), 1-50. Also see Arthur T. Donohue, "Financing a Catholic College in Kansas in 1850," Illinois Catholic Historical Review 11 (April 1929), 291-98.

21. Robert F. Berkhofer, Jr., The White Man's Indian (New York, 1978), 86-96. Also see Martin Zanger, "Red Bird," in R. David Edmunds, ed., American Indian Leaders: Studies in Diversity (Lincoln, 1980), 64-87, and Edmunds, Tecumseh and the Quest for Indian Leadership (Boston, 1984), 223-25.

22. Berkhofer, The White Man's Indian, plate 8 (following page 138).

23. James J. Rawls, Indians of California: The Changing Image (Norman, 1984).

24. Francis Paul Prucha, American Indian Policy in the Formative Years (Lincoln, 1970); Francis Paul Prucha, American Indian Policy in Crisis (Norman, 1976).

25. Prucha, American Indian Policy in Crisis, 132-69.

26. John D. Unruh, Jr., The Plains Across: The Overland Emigrants and the Trans-Mississippi West, 1840-1860 (Urbana, IL, 1979), 156-200.

27. Ibid., 181.

28. Ibid., 184-185. Also see Glenda Riley, "The Specter of a

Savage: Rumors and Alarmism on the Overland Trail," The Western History Quarterly, 15 (October 1984), 427-44.

29. See R. David Edmunds, The Shawnee Prophet (Lincoln, 1983), and Edmunds, Tecumseh. Also see Entries for June 10-July 15, 1808, Diary of William Claus, Claus Family Papers, Manuscript Group 19, Vol. 9, 198-99, Public Archives of Canada; Harrison to the Secretary of War, August 6, 1810, in Esarey, Harrison Letters, 1, 456-59.

30. Edmunds, Tecumseh, 213-225.

31. Richard White, The Roots of Dependency: Subsistence, Environment, and Social Change Among the Choctaws, Pawnees, and Navajos (Lincoln, 1983), 1-146.

33. James P. Ronda, Lewis and Clark Among the Indians (Lincoln, 1984); H. Craig Miner, The Corporation and the Indian: Tribal Sovereignty and Industrial Civilization in Indian Territory, 1865-1907 (Columbia, MO, 1976).

714-26-01

Integrating Indian History into a Survey Course
in Nineteenth Century American History

Judith Sealander
Wright State University

Often invitations do not come at the right moment. Helen Tanner's invitation to me, however, to discuss ways to incorporate Indian history into classroom presentations, did. After more than a decade of debate, after dozens of proposals and endless revisions, my university has endorsed a dramatically new mandatory general education curriculum, emphasizing math, science, English composition, and history. Beginning in 1987, every entering student at Wright State must take a 30 week, three-quarter sequential course in Western Civilization. Wright State Americanists are planning to teach some of the 3,500 new students a year who will be studying Western civilization as a cross-Atlantic and not solely a Europe-centered phenomenon. We are also, as a direct consequence of the Western civilization revolution, drastically revising our traditional American history survey, which now exists as two separate, freshman-level 10 week, one quarter, courses, divided at the Civil War, required of education, but not history majors, and taken often by other students for general education credits, though usually not in sequence and not as a unit.

Students needing just three major hours of general education to graduate will no longer crowd into large lecture sections of post-Civil War American history, having never encountered pre-Civil War American history. No longer part of the general education cafeteria, our redesigned United States history sequence will be a sophomore-level 30 week, three-quarter sequential course, required of

history as well as education majors, divided into a course on America in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, a second course on America in the nineteenth century, and a third course on America in the twentieth century. The classes will be smaller; the sections will be fewer. The chance to teach potentially better prepared students using a year long format of courses to be taken in sequence makes me optimistic about the teaching environment, if not my future place in the universe of "weighted student-faculty credit ratio optimum budget forecasting reviews."

Paralleling R. David Edmunds' subject matter, I have drawn up for this conference a proposed syllabus for the second 10 week course in our new American history survey sequence, "America in the Nineteenth Century." You can see my choices for textbooks, readers, library assignments, and books acceptable for book reviews. You can also see how I plan to grade and what I plan to lecture. What I propose to do now, therefore, is to explore a few themes in the history of America in the nineteenth century which demand treatment of Indian history and to indicate more fully the content of the lectures and discussions which will introduce those themes to students in the classroom. Those themes include federalism and states' rights, westward expansion, Americanism and democracy, racism in America, and the status of women.

Many survey courses in nineteenth century American history begin with discussions of the "new nation," federalism, and states' rights. The course I propose would as well, but with a focus sharpened by attention to Indian history. Indian peoples played large roles in shaping the nature of colonial governments. They continued to influence disputes between federal and state governments in the

nineteenth century. Moreover, the presence of Indians and Indian lands affected decisions about expansion or limitation of state and federal power. Thomas Jefferson entered the presidency in 1800 as inheritor of a long colonial legacy of fear of centralized power. Students could be led to examine the dilemmas posed to the still unsettled balances between federal and state power by the surrounding Indian nations. America, for instance, recoiling from its experience as a British colony, distrusted a standing army in peace time. In fact, Congress only appropriated small amounts of money for an army because of the chance or reality of Indian hostilities. But the federal army did not, and probably could not, preserve peace on the new United States borders. Instead frontier militias, local police, and later state legislatures, often in opposition to federal policy, took matters into their own hands. The conflict between Georgia and the Cherokee Nation in the 1820s and 1830s, which became a conflict between Georgia and the United States Supreme Court as well, provides a useful classroom illustration of the theme. In 1802 Georgia ceded its claims to western territory beyond its boundaries in exchange for the federal government's extinguishing title to Indian lands within the state's borders. Between 1802 and 1827 Georgia pressed both the federal government and the Cherokee Nation, the federal government to keep what state officials claimed was its part of the bargain, the Cherokees to surrender more of their land within the state. When the Cherokees refused, and the federal government proved, to Georgia's eyes, balky, the Georgia legislature asserted that all Indians were simply state tenants, subject to state laws and state control. Students would examine the nature of this battle, as well as the

Cherokee Nation v. Georgia and Worcester v. Georgia decisions in the lecture titled "Indian Removal."

The lecture scheduled on the Mexican War, moreover, could further explore ways Indians focused federal-state conflicts. Texas, which came directly into the Union as a state in 1845, demanded complete control of its Indian populations. In April 1846, the Texas state legislature informed Washington that it recognized no federal rights to make any treaties with Indians within Texas state jurisdiction. But in May 1846, the federal government, already at war and concerned that Indian tribes would side with Mexico, did just that, signing an agreement with eleven Texas tribes, promising federal protection in exchange for Indian friendship with the United States. The Texas delegation in Washington, enraged, demanded that the federal government retract its promises. Congress, not wishing to challenge Texas during wartime, ratified the Treaty of Council Springs, but only after excising paragraphs asserting federal jurisdiction over the Texas tribes. Students exposed to both the Georgia and Texas case studies could develop not only a better understanding of federal-state power struggles, but also the beginnings of a more sophisticated awareness that in the nineteenth century sovereignty disputes were, in many cases, three-way battles involving not only questions of federal and state, but also tribal rights.¹

Moreover, Indian history clarifies another aspect of the theme of federalism and states' rights. A student of nineteenth century American history could be helped to trace, through examination of the federal government's relations with Indians, the growth of both federal power and society's willingness to delegate private functions

to the public sector. As Michael Paul Rogin has argued, "Jackson first developed, in Indian relations, the major formulas of Jacksonian Democracy."² He saw himself, Rogin argues, not just as "father" to Indians, but to the American people in general, who, in turn, began to identify with the Presidency in much more personal terms. The lectures scheduled on antebellum reform movements, could note ways in which early nineteenth century reformers echoed the Jacksonian formula of government as benevolent father. Those who favored compulsory state schooling or government operation of orphanages and insane asylums were, usually without conscious awareness, often using models first formulated by a federal government attempting to develop Indian policy. Students confronting the federal government as "protector" of Indians would, if led properly, also confront the even larger question of emerging modern government in the nineteenth century, government as substitute for family, individual and not just Indian as dependent.³

Of course, the federal inability or unwillingness to intervene when Indians sought true protection against the encroachments of western states, not only illustrates the theme of federalism and states' rights, but also that of western expansion. The lectures listed in the syllabus on the "Louisiana Purchase," "The War of 1812," "Indian Removal," "The Mexican War," "The Defeat of the Plains Sioux," "American Culture and the American Frontier," and "Ghost Dancing and Plains Indians" all could be vehicles for discussion of a topic shaped by Indian America as well as white America. Contemporaries portrayed America as a land upon which God smiled, a land with a Manifest Destiny to conquer vast wilderness for civilization. Students, by studying Indian history, will discover a more complicated story. In

fact, I would plan to introduce the theme of western expansion during the first week of class in the case study lecture on the Louisiana Purchase by first noting that even the concept of wilderness deserves scrutiny. Stephen Pyne has pointed out that Indians, through the use of fire, the "red buffalo," substantially altered the American environment, both in woodland and plains areas and continued to do so into the nineteenth century. Fikret Berke notes the ways that Indian shaped wild fish and game populations.⁴ So, rather than encountering an "unspoiled" wilderness white Americans moved west into areas consciously controlled and changed for centuries by Native Americans. Students could, through the specific planned lectures mentioned, as well as through overview lectures, begin to see American western expansion as the story not just of a superior and divinely blessed culture marching to its destiny, but as the infinitely more challenging story of at least two, and often more than two, interacting cultures. As Edmunds wisely points out, such lectures should note the ways Indian, as well as whites, shaped western expansion. One vehicle I would use to illustrate that kind of mutual interaction would be the lecture planned on the War of 1812, too often a war in whose honor teachers force their students to learn how to spell impressment and then move on. If seen as a war in which Indians under Tecumseh allied with the British to further their own efforts to keep Americans out of their territories, the War of 1812 becomes more interesting, more complex, especially since many of my students come from southern Ohio towns with names like Piqua and Shawnee Village and drive past the Tecumseh Motel on their way to Wright State. They would not only be able to see that American goals included a quest for

empire in the West as well as for freedom of the seas, but they would also learn how Indian peoples in the early nineteenth century contested the former goal. Moreover, as Edmunds has suggested, discussions of American culture and the American frontier should mention ways in which Indian peoples themselves, especially the Five Southern Tribes, acted, along with whites, as transmitters of a new "American" culture on the frontier. A discussion of frontier culture in the 1840s through the 1880s which includes Indian history would leave students with visions of more than calico and sod houses. They could learn, for instance, that the five southern tribes were themselves western frontier settlers who, despite the differing circumstances of their migrations, planted cotton fields, established rural school systems, sometimes built fine mansions, and hardly fit Hollywood images of Indians dressed in loincloths and on the trail of the buffalo.

Of course, Indians such as the Sioux who did hunt buffalo eventually also experienced, as had the southern tribes earlier, defeat and removal, at least removal to reservation lands. That reality demands not just the development of the theme of western expansion but also the theme of Americanism and democracy, crucial to an understanding of the history of nineteenth century America. As early as 1835, Alexis de Tocqueville noticed how important their own self-image seemed to Americans, how the ideal American was a self-made democrat. Founding Fathers such as James Madison had worried about democracy, connecting it to mob rule, but by the nineteenth century democracy and Americanism had become linked. Of course a society which romanticized and made great virtues of individualism, equality

and self-reliance and denoted these traits as characteristic of Americans, was a society for which the frontier promise of cheap or free land and untrammelled chances for individual upward mobility became even more important.⁵ Those who impeded acquisition of these lands became un-American, un-democratic, to be either civilized or defeated. Robert Berkhofer has argued that an emphasis on individualism placed Indian tribalism in direct opposition to Americanism and demanded that Indians join American society as individuals, as people who also valued egalitarianism, private land holding, industry, self-reliance, Christianity, and material acquisition.⁶ Merrill Gates, president of Amherst College and an important organizer of the influential Lake Mohonk Conference of the Friends of the Indian, epitomized the attitude in a speech which ended:

In his dull savagery (the Indian) must be touched by the wings of the divine angel of discontent . . . Discontent with the teepee and the starving rations of the Indian camp in winter is needed to get the Indian out of the blanket and into trousers, and trousers with a pocket in them, and with a pocket that aches to be filled with dollars.

The lectures scheduled on American culture, the American frontier, and Victorian society could more richly explain what nineteenth century Americans came to value as Americanism by illustrating contrasting contemporary values, such as tribalism. Why, students could begin to ask, was nineteenth century Americanism so unwilling to tolerate challenge? Why did Americans demand, not only that Indians, but also millions of European immigrants abandon former languages, lifestyles, and beliefs? What were the costs and the benefits for a society that demanded that all its residents esteem Americanism?

Americanism, however, must be discussed in tandem with another important phenomenon, racism, in order to understand roles played by Indians in nineteenth century America. Students who, in the second week of my proposed course have an assignment to read Mary Young's article, "The Cherokee Nation: Mirror of the Republic" would soon discover that the Cherokees had by the nineteenth century seemingly adopted numerous "American" values.⁸ Many had become Presbyterians, people who farmed for a living, sent their children to schools, and dressed in frock coats, collars, and top hats, rather than turbans and ear-bobs on important occasions. But, in the end, their surface transformation into ideal Americans did not prevent their removal, along with almost all other eastern tribes. Students who study racism as a white-Indian, as well as white-black phenomenon, will be better equipped to understand American culture and society and the complex distinctions Americans made between whites and non-whites. Lives of Indian "mixed-bloods" could be introduced into scheduled lectures on racism and American slavery to illustrate that neither racism nor slavery involved only whites and blacks. John Ross, for instance, half-Cherokee, half-white, owned slaves, ran a large plantation, had interests in stores, mills, and ferries, and was, except for the color of his skin, a man the South's planter elite should have welcomed into its ranks.⁹ When the United States Congress debated the annexation of Mexico after the American victory in the Mexican War, many politicians opposed complete acceptance of the area as an American territory because of their belief that the Mexicans were Indians.¹⁰ Scheduled lectures on immigration in the nineteenth century might further develop the theme of racism by noting the overt discrimination

practiced against such groups as Jews, Irish, and Italians. Students could also be led to see ways by which some of that discrimination eased for European immigrants, but not for blacks, and not for Native Americans. Classes could be told, for instance, of a colonial Maryland statute which specified that testimony of slaves or Indians could not be heard in cases involving Christian whites. In 1847, Maryland revised its laws on evidence, so that "hereafter, slaves or Indians could not testify in a case involving any white, Jew, or Christian."¹¹

During the final week of class, as students encounter the major topic of American emergence into greater power status, they will read Walter Williams' article, "United States Indian Policy and the Debate over Philippine Annexation" and, I hope, will hear echoes of the Mexican territories debate as they study the arguments of late nineteenth century anti-imperialists motivated at least partially by a fear of future citizenship for "Indians and people of color." Of course students who had already examined the Cherokee Nation v. Georgia decision could better understand pro-imperialists' assurances that Filipino as well as Indian could be "wards," "dependent nations," not citizens, that American had, in its treatment of the Indian question, actually been an imperial nation all along.¹² Of course, as Edmunds has noted already in a fascinating aside, nineteenth century American racism was never simple, and color bars between whites and Indians were sometimes not as severe as they were for whites and blacks. Frontier whites who claimed Indian wives, may, he argues, have been marrying up.

While a few Choctaw, Creek, Cherokee, or Seminole women may, through marriage, have raised the status of their white husbands in nineteenth century Oklahoma, most Indian women found that neither their status, nor that of their husbands, improved. In fact, roles played by Indian women emerge as an important counterpoint to the last major theme to be discussed here today, the status of women in the nineteenth century. Lectures scheduled for the second and eighth week of the term on cultural standards and expectations for women as well as real female roles would include Indian and black as well as white women. Clearly, even for many white women, prevailing nineteenth century social standards which placed women in the home, as preservers of family, hearth, and religion, existed as ideals or myths, not realities. But any attempt to explore realities for American women in the nineteenth century should explore the impact of "cult of domesticity" expectations on not just whites. Indian women, in fact, may have experienced even more dramatic changes in their lives than did white women. The lectures scheduled on women's roles would explore not only economic, social, and political patterns experienced by "Lady and Mill Girl," that is by white upper and working class women, but also "Squaw and Slave Mammy," Indian and black women. White America asked Indian women as well as Indian men to adopt its standards with profound implications for the traditional economic, cultural, and social roles Indian women had played. Mary Wright, for instance, has noted in her studies of the fur trade in the Pacific Northwest that Indian women traditionally had high status, often rising to religious or economic leadership. But, as "store goods" and contact with white traders became more important by the 1830s Indian

women gradually lost their control over patterns of work and consumption. White cultural assumptions demanded that treaty-making and trading be done with men. By the mid-nineteenth century Wright concluded that Chinook Indian women had lost traditional economic and cultural functions within their own tribes and had found sadly diminished new opportunities as servants and prostitutes at trading posts.¹³

I'm sure others here in this room could come up with other key themes which could prove helpful in adapting Indian history to American history surveys. As we know, however, survey teaching demands rigorous weeding and selection of examples and topics. To prune out Indian history, or never to plant it in the first place, however, would be a great mistake.

714-22-01

NOTES

¹ See, for instance, Michael Green, "Federal-State Conflict in the Administration of Indian Policy: Georgia, Alabama, and the Creeks," (Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Iowa, 1973); Allen Guttman, ed., States' Rights and Indian Removal: The Cherokee Nation v. the State of Georgia (Boston, 1965); Robert Trennert, "The Far Western Indian Frontier and the Beginnings of the Reservation System, 1846-1851," (Ph.D. Dissertation, University of California at Santa Barbara, 1969).

² Michael Paul Rogin, Fathers and Children: Andrew Jackson and the Subjugation of the American Indian (New York, 1975), 166.

³ David Rothman, The Discovery of the Asylum (Boston, 1971); Michael Katz, The Irony of Early School Reform (Cambridge, Mass., 1968); Carl Kaestle, "Between the Scylla of Brutal Ignorance and the Charybdis of a Literary Education," in Schooling and Society: Studies in the History of Education (Baltimore, Md., 1978).

⁴ Stephen Pyne, Fire in America: A Cultural History of Wilderness and Rural Fire (Princeton, N.J., 1982); Fikret Berkes, "Fishery Resource Use in a Subarctic Community," Human Ecology 5 (1977), 289-307.

⁵ For an interesting interpretation of DeToqueville's views on this subject see: Gary Stein, "'And the Strife Never Ends': Indian-White Hostility as Seen by European Travelers in America, 1800-1860," Ethnohistory 20 (Spring 1973), 173-87.

⁶ Robert Berkhofer, The White Man's Indian: Images of American Indian From Columbus to the Present (New York, 1979), 155.

⁷ Quoted in Ibid., 173.

⁸ Mary Young, "The Cherokee Nation: Mirror of the Republic," American Quarterly 33 (Winter 1981), 502-24.

⁹ Gary Moulton, John Ross: Cherokee Chief (Athens, Ga., 1978); William McLaughlin, "Red Indians, Black Slavery, and White Racism: America's Slaveholding Indians," American Quarterly 26 (Fall 1974), 366-85.

¹⁰ Michael Paul Rogin, Fathers and Children, 309-311.

¹¹ Morton Bordon, Jews, Turks, and Infidels (Chapel Hill, N.C., 1984), 141.

¹² Walter Williams, "United States Indian Policy and the Debate over Philippine Annexation: Implications for the Origins of American Imperialism," Journal of American History 66 (March 1980), 810-31.

¹³ Mary Wright, "Economic Development and Native American Women in the Early Nineteenth Century," American Quarterly 33 (Winter, 1981), 525-37.

Judith Sealander

A Proposed Syllabus for History 202,
A Sophomore Survey Course:
American History in the Nineteenth Century

(Part of a 3 course sequence required of all history majors and education majors and open to all undergraduates. 10 week quarter system, MWF schedule 3-50 minute class meetings a week. Class size: approximately 70 persons).

This course aims to survey major issues raised by the history of 19th century America. To some, the 19th century seems very distant--a time of Indian warfare, young soldiers posing stiffly for Civil War daguerrotypes, men in odd-looking hats in yellowed photographs of equally old-looking early factory machinery.

Yet we must understand the important changes of the 19th century if we are to understand our own age better. Western expansion, industrialization, urbanization, and the rise of the large corporation strained and stretched the American social, political, and economic structure. Slavery split it, as the United States fought a bloody Civil War.

We will explore both the upper and underside of 19th century American history: the general and the foot soldier, the lady and the mill girl, the "robber baron" industrial tycoon and the immigrant ditch digger, the success ethic of Horatio Alger and the despair of Sioux Ghost Dancers.

The events and crises of the 19th century raise many issues still confronting us today. What is a fair political system, how do we define civil rights and human equality, what is our role in the world community? As one historian has said, "History does not repeat itself, however, it can shed light on the alternatives and possibilities."

Course Assignments:

1. A List of Discussion Questions.

Although I hope that you will read every week's reading assignments with critical attention, you will be assigned one week of the quarter to commit yourself to a particularly careful reading of the materials in the syllabus. Each week approximately 10% of the class will act as discussion leaders--so you will not be alone. During this week you will be expected to help me raise pertinent questions. On Monday each week, chosen individuals will turn in their lists of proposed discussion questions and topics from the reading. Ten questions (no answers need to be written out) would be about the right number. Of course, this is not the only week during the term in which your comments and questions will be appreciated and expected.

2. A 5-7 Book Review.

You must choose the book to be read from among the list below. These books are available in the library here; most can be found in the public library downtown. I have also ordered them to be put on the SUGGESTED readings list for this course. They are all available in the bookstore as paperbacks. You are to write an ANALYSIS of the book. It will not be enough to simply report what the author says, although, of course, it is important to summarize the book clearly. You should look at his/her use of sources. Are the sources used persuasive? Can the author make a good case for his/her argument? Of what value is the book in reaching a better understanding of this period in American history? NOTE: You are required to read only ONE book for this book review assignment, not all of these books.

Richard Current	<u>Lincoln and the First Shot</u>
Ronald Walters	<u>American Reformers, 1815-1860</u>
David Edmunds	<u>Tecumseh</u>
Sandra Myres	<u>Westering Women and the Frontier Experience</u>
David Ward	<u>Cities and Immigrants</u>
John Blassingame	<u>The Slave Community</u>

3. Midterm and Final.

You will have 2 exams in this course. The midterm will require you to write one long essay and a series of short paragraphs which identify events, persons, or phenomena. The final will require you to write three essays--two of which will pose questions about material introduced since the midterm, one of which will be comprehensive. I will distribute study sheets to help you prepare for these exams.

4. Grading Percentages.

The grading for this course will be as follows: EACH of the two tests--35%, the paper--25%. The remaining 5% of your grade will be based on attendance, the quality of your questions (written and oral,) and the interest you show in class. While I cannot base this solely on the quantitative data (such as the number of times you raise your hand) in such a large class, I will keep track of those who attend regularly and contribute to discussions. The success of this class depends on your being involved.

Required Books

The following texts are required. You may buy them in the campus bookstore.

David Burner, Elizabeth Fox-Genovese, Eugene Genovese	<u>An American Portrait</u> (You will use this book for the entire sequence History 201, 202, 203--Chapters 7-19 for this course)
---	--

John Cary and
Julius Weinberg, eds.

The Social Fabric, Vols. I-II
(These books will be used for the
entire sequence 201, 202, 203-For
this course you will read Chapters
7-20 in Vol. I and Chapters 1-7 in
Vol. II)

(Materials on Reserve as listed in assigned reading schedule)

Weekly Topic and Reading Schedule

WEEK ONE: The New Nation, 1800-1828

An American Portrait, Chapter 7, "Independence Confirmed 1800-1816"

An American Portrait, Chapter 8, "Nationalism and Sectionalism
1816-1828"

Social Fabric, Vol. I, Chapter 8, "Religious Democracy"

Also-read a xeroxed article in the Library Reserve Room from a 1981
issue of the American Quarterly, Mary Young, "The Cherokee
Nation: Mirror of the Republic"

WEEK TWO: Jackson's America, 1828-1840

An American Portrait, Chapter 9, "The Jacksonian Era 1828-1840"

An American Portrait, Chapter 10, "DeTocqueville's America
1820-1860"

Social Fabric, Vol. I, Chapter 10, Trail of Tears: (From Dale Van
Every, Disinherited: The Lost Birthright of the American Indian.)

WEEK THREE: An Age of Reform? America Society and Culture Between 1820-1860

An American Portrait, Chapter 11, "The Logic of Democracy 1820-1860"

Social Fabric Vol. I, Chapter 9, "The Status of Women": (From
Barbara J. Berg, The Remembered Gate.)

Social Fabric, Vol. I, Chapter 11, "America: Wet and Dry": (From
Mark E. Lender and James K. Marti, Drinking in America: A
History.)

Social Fabric, Vol. I, Chapter 12, "The Reform Impulse": (From
Joseph M. Hawes, Children in Urban Society.)

Social Fabric, Vol. I, Chapter 13, "Utopian Communes": (From
Edward D. Andrews, The People Called Shakers.)

WEEK FOUR: The Industrial North and the Slave South, 1800-1860

Social Fabric, Vol. I, Chapter 7, "Beginnings of Industrialism":
(From Joseph and Frances Gies, "The Ingenious Yankees.")

Social Fabric, Vol. I, Chapter 14, "The Black Family": (From
Leslie H. Owens, This Species of Property.)

Social Fabric, Vol. I, Chapter 15, "Nation of Immigrants":
(From Carl Wittke, We Who Built America.)

Social Fabric, Vol. I, Chapter 16, "Urban Problems": (From
Michael Feldberg, The Turbulent Era: Riot and Disorder in
Jacksonian America.)

Social Fabric, Vol. I, Chapter 17, "The Industrial Worker":
(From Norman J. Ware, The Industrial Worker: 1840-1860.)

Social Fabric Vol. I, Chapter 19, "The Abolitionist Impulse":
(From Robert Abzug, Passionate Liberator: Theodore Dwight
Weld and the Dilemma of Reform.)

WEEK FIVE: Western Expansion and Sectional Tension, 1840-1860

An American Portrait, Chapter 12, "Expansion and Division: The
1840's"

An American Portrait, Chapter 13, "Distant Thunder: The 1850s"

Social Fabric, Vol. I, Chapter 18, "The Way West": (From
John Unruh, The Plains Across.)

WEEK SIX: Civil War and Reconstruction, 1860-1880

An American Portrait, Chapter 14, "Civil War and Reconstruction"

Social Fabric, Vol. I, Chapter 20, "The Price of War": (From
Allan Nevins, The Glorious and the Terrible.)

Social Fabric, Vol. II, Chapter 1, "After Slavery": (From
Joel Williamson, After Slavery.)

WEEK SEVEN: The Push West, 1865-1900

An American Portrait, Chapter 15, "The Westward Thrust 1865-1900"

Social Fabric, Vol. II, Chapter 2, "The Mining Frontier": (From
Watson Parker, Deadwood: The Golden Years.)

Social Fabric, Vol. II, Chapter 3, "The Death of the Plains
Indians": (From Ralph K. Andrist, The Long Death.)

WEEK EIGHT: "Acres of Diamonds"?: American Industrialism and Urbanization,
1865-1900

An American Portrait, Chapter 16, "The Ironies of Industrialism
1865-1900"

An American Portrait, Chapter 17, "The American City 1865-1900"

Social Fabric, Vol. II, Chapter 4, "The Small Town in the Gilded Age" (From Lewis E. Atherton, Main Street on the Middle Border.)

Social Fabric, Vol. II, Chapter 5, "The City in the Gilded Age":
(From Michael Novak, The Guns of Lattimer.)

Social Fabric, Vol. II, Chapter 7, "Sex in Victorian America":
(From John S. Haller and Robin M. Haller, The Physician and Sexuality in Victorian America.)

WEEK NINE: "The Outsiders": Non Industrial America in the Gilded Age

An American Portrait, Chapter 18, "The Outsiders 1865-1900"

WEEK TEN: America Emerges as a World Power 1870-1900

An American Portrait, Chapter 19, "The Outward Thrust 1865-1914"

Also read a xeroxed article in Library Reserve from a 1980 issue of The Journal of American History, Walter Williams, "United States Indian Policy and the Debate over Philippine Annexation: Implications for the Origins of American Imperialism."

Lecture, Examination, and Discussion Schedule

(Most weeks we will follow a pattern of one overview lecture on Monday, followed by two case studies on Wednesday and Friday which illustrate in greater detail key events or phenomena important to the general topic of the week. Occasionally, as noted, we will devote a class period to discussion.)

WEEK ONE: The New Nation, 1800-1828

Lecture One: Overview of Politics and Society in The New American Republic

Lecture Two: The Louisiana Purchase

Lecture Three: The War of 1812

WEEK TWO: Jackson's America, 1828-1840

Lecture One: Overview of Political Developments in Jackson's America, 1824-1840

Lecture Two: The Election of Andrew Jackson and The Emergence of a New National Two Party Sytem

Lecture Three: Indian Removal

WEEK THREE: An Age of Reform? America Society and Culture Between 1820-1860

Lecture One: Overview of Economics and Society in Jackson's America, 1828-1840

Lecture Two: Women's Roles and Status in the Early Nineteenth Century: Lady, Mill Girl, Slave Mammy, Squaw.

Discussion Three: American Antebellum Reform Movements:
Class discussion on Chapter 11-13 in the Social Fabric

Mark Lender and James Martin Drinking in America: A History

Joseph Hawes Children in Urban Society

Edward Andrews The People Called Shakers

(I will provide a brief overview of issues and themes historians see raised by antebellum reformers. You must come to class prepared to participate fully in a 30 minute discussion.)

WEEK FOUR: The Industrial North and the Slave South, 1800-1860

Lecture One: Overview of Economic, Political, Social Patterns in the North and South, 1800-1860

Lecture Two: Racism and Slavery in Nineteenth Century America

Lecture Three: "Them Irish Keep Coming"-New Cities, New Immigrants

WEEK FIVE: Western Expansion and Sectional Tension, 1840-1860

Midterm replaces Lecture One, see notes on midterm in syllabus: page 2.

Lecture Two: Growing Divisions Between North and South, 1840-1860: An Overview of Major Issues

Lecture Three: The Mexican War

WEEK SIX: Civil War and Reconstruction, 1860-1880

Lecture One: Overview of the Military, Political, Social and Economic Impact of the Civil War and Reconstruction

Lecture Two: Lincoln v. Davis: Leadership and Government Structure in Union and Confederacy During the Civil War.

Lecture Three: Reconstruction and the South: Louisiana as Case Study

WEEK SEVEN: The Push West, 1865-1900

Lecture One: Overview of the Social, Economic and Political Implications of American Conquest of the West, 1865-1900

Lecture Two: The Defeat of the Plains Tribes: The Sioux as Case Study

Lecture Three: American Culture and the American Frontier

WEEK EIGHT: "Acres of Diamonds"? American Industrialization and Urbanization 1865-1900

Lecture One: Overview of Social, Economic and Political Impact of Industrialism, Urbanization, and the Rise of Corporations

Lecture Two: The Union Movement and the City Boss in Late Nineteenth Century America.

Lecture Three: Victorian Culture and Standards: A Product of Industrialization and Urbanization?

WEEK NINE: "The Outsiders": Non-Industrial America in the Gilded Age

Lecture One: Overview of Social, Economic, and Political Developments in Rural and Frontier America, 1865-1900

Lecture Two: The Farmer's Movement: The Farmers' Alliance
and Populism

Lecture Three: Ghost Dancing and Plains Indians

WEEK TEN: America Emerges as a World Power 1870-1900

Lecture One: Overview Social, Economic, and Diplomatic
Consequences of America's Rise as a World Power in the Late
Nineteenth Century

Lecture Two: The Spanish American War

Discussion Three: Imperialists v. Anti-Imperialists. I
will first provide an overview, but come prepared to
participate fully in a 30 minute discussion centering
around Walter Williams article, "United States Indian
Policy and the Debate over Philippine Annexation:
Implications for the Origins of American Imperialism"
(Xeroxed on Reserve.)

714-22-02

Indians in the Twentieth Century

Donald L. Parman

Purdue University

This paper, by necessity, offers a very general discussion of the subject. Important matters can only be dealt with briefly and other topics which deserve treatment in a longer piece have been omitted. My approach will be to (1) outline the major periods of Indian history of the twentieth century and (2) to relate each to the contemporary national history.¹

Before we begin to discuss the twentieth century, however, we need to look back at the reservation system and land allotment because these two factors created a situation which greatly affected (and still affects) Indians throughout this century.

Starting in the 1850s and continuing through the military conquests of the Trans-Mississippi tribes, the government established numerous reservations for Indian groups. Where before Indians had made land sessions and then were displaced westward to new areas, the reservation system saw them ceding most of their lands but retaining a portion as reservations.² We should also note that the pre-reservation policies had acted as a giant bulldozer displacing Indian groups and forcing them ahead of white settlement. In the process, Indians often retained some degree of autonomy, remained somewhat isolated from white society, and continued part of their traditional life. The reservation policy, in contrast, fixed Indians in permanent enclaves, and white settlement surrounded the Indians'

lands. In addition, reservation life meant that the Bureau of Indian Affairs exercised much greater control over all aspects of Indians' lives.

The General Allotment Act of 1887, the second important background development, complemented the reservation system.³ Most whites believed that reservations contained far more land than the Indians needed and also wanted the eradication of tribal property and tribalism. In terms of its broader purpose, the assimilation of Indians, allotment offered little that was new. Federal policy from the first had always been directed toward transforming Indians from hunter-warriors to yeoman farmers and their acceptance of white life and values. Nor was allotment untried. Small Indian groups in Kansas and Michigan had been allotted well before 1887, and treaties, agreements, and statutes from the 1860s commonly provided for possible allotment of reservations. Some 11,000 allotments, indeed, existed before 1885.⁴ What made the 1887 legislation important was its scope; it authorized the president to order the allotment of nearly all reservations which he believed suited to agriculture or grazing.

The actual allotment process saw the assignment of lands to individuals as follows: 160 acres to the heads of families, 80 acres to single individuals over eighteen or to orphans, and 40 acres to unmarried persons under eighteen. To guard against the Indians' sales of allotments, the legislation placed the land under federal trust for twenty-five years. This meant that allotments could not be sold, encumbered, or, according to later court decisions, taxed. Allotment automatically conferred citizenship on the allottees, and placed them under state or territorial laws. In sum, allotment was aimed at the

destruction of tribal organizations, traditional kinship structures, and native religious institutions.

Surplus lands or unassigned holdings not used for allotment remained under tribal title, and supposedly their sale to the government, either before or after actual allotment, was voluntary. In truth, few tribes succeeded in resisting official pressures to sell their lands. The funds derived from such sales went into the national treasury to be used for education and "civilization," but only congress could appropriate the money. Surplus lands, once sold, became free for entry on the same basis as the public domain.

Numerous criticisms have been raised about the effects of allotment. To cite only a few: the government allotted many reservations where local geographic conditions dictated that only extensive ranching could bring any benefits to Indians; it sharply reduced the land base of Indians and denied them sufficient holdings for possible future population increases; it was not followed by adequate federal capital, practical training, and white expertise necessary for Indians to gain a livelihood from allotments; and it divided and redivided allotments among heirs after the original allottee died until the land was virtually unuseable except to lease to whites.

We should also note that legislation in 1891 allowed whites to lease allotments.⁵ Originally aimed at permitting the very young, the elderly, and the handicapped to derive some income from their allotments, leasing by 1900 was widespread among all Indians. Leasing had two effects. First, it kept many Indians from realizing more than a pittance from their allotments, and, secondly, leasing arrangements

were, I suspect, the single largest source of graft between agents and local whites until the 1930s.

Despite all the serious problems of the reservations, allotments, and the assimilation goals they embodied, the late nineteenth century policy philosophy remained virtually unchallenged during the first two decades of the next century.

As we turn to the progressive period, 1900-1920, it becomes quite apparent that major Indian policies and legislation were linked to the earlier period.⁶ Actual allotment, for example, was a cumbersome and slow process, and it was carried on continuously until well into the 1920s. Moreover, major Indian legislation tended to supplement the General Allotment Act rather than strike off in new directions. In 1902, for example, congress authorized the sale of allotments in instances when the original allottee had died. The proceeds of such sales were divided among the heirs. Since only whites could normally afford such purchases, the so-called Dead Indian Act further reduced the Indian land base.⁷

A much more important supplemental law was the Burke Act of 1906. No one, I believe, has uncovered adequate materials to explain the full motivation behind the legislation, but Commissioner Francis E. Leupp believed that many Indian Allotees were not ready for citizenship. He was also concerned about a recent supreme court decision which held that Indian citizens were no longer subject to liquor control laws. The law itself denied citizenship at the time of allotment. The twenty-five year trust period remained, but, in the future, the Secretary of Interior could at any time issue a fee simple title and convey citizenship to any allottee certified as "competent."⁸

While no one has, to my knowledge, studied the immediate effects of the Burke Act, there was a rush of applications for fee simple titles and an equal willingness of agents and superintendents to certify the applicants as competent. Results of a later questionnaire indicated that a great majority of allottees who obtained fee simple titles quickly sold their land, usually at well below market value, and squandered their money on frivolous purchases. More rigorous screening of applications afterward reduced this problem, but the Burke Act remained in force.⁹

The Omnibus Act of 1910, often neglected by scholars, was highly important legislation which permitted more variation in the size of allotments for different categories of lands such as irrigation projects or grazing areas. It also defined guidelines for probating allotments and allowed the government to carry on a broader range of activities in forestry and irrigation.¹⁰

Progressive period Indian affairs also contained a good deal of emphasis on what today would be called "resource development." My time does not permit a full discussion of these efforts, but starting with Commissioner Leupp in 1905 and continuing through the administrations of Commissioners Robert Valentine and Cato Sells, various programs attempted to make Indians self-supporting. A few examples will hopefully indicate the direction of such efforts. Leupp established an employment bureau in the BIA which recruited Indians for construction jobs and migratory labor.¹¹ Valentine began the practice of winning money from a reluctant congress by securing reimbursable loans instead of gratuity appropriations. Used to finance irrigation, livestock purchases and other self-help endeavors,

the reimbursable loans were charged against the tribes and paid back from tribal income. Sells' perceptions of Indian affairs was very much guided by his personal background in banking and ranching. After a tour of reservations in 1913, Sells recognized that Indians lacked the resources to utilize their land, and he greatly expanded reimbursable loans to meet their farming and ranching needs. Unfortunately, when some of Sells' programs seemed to have succeeded, he reversed himself in 1917 and encouraged Indians to sell off their herds and to lease their land to white farmers in the "Great Plow-up" of W.W. I.¹²

Sells' administration, however, is usually remembered because of his aggressive application of the Burke Act. Interior Secretary Franklin Lane saw the legislation as a means of freeing the more capable Indians and their allotments from government control and then concentrating official aid on the less capable. Instead of allowing allottees to apply for competency certificates, Sells in 1915 and 1916 seized the initiative by organizing competency commissions which toured reservations, and, in conjunction with superintendents, screened tribal rolls to determine which Indians should receive fee patents to allotments. Predictable problems arose. Many of the supposedly competent Indians quickly sold their land and squandered the money, further reducing the land base and adding to the growing number of landless Indians. Those allottees who did not want competency and saw no value in citizenship were still forced to receive fee simple titles. Despite these problems, the competency commissions remained active until late in Wilson's second term.¹³

Other progressive Indian policies complemented the drive to make Indians self-supporting. Superintendents appointed by the civil service commission gradually replaced agents named through the spoils system. The "new superintendents" were expected to take a more active role in securing reimbursable loans, developing irrigation, and encouraging Indian farming and ranching.¹⁴ Progressives also decentralized field administration by breaking large reservations into several smaller agencies, so field workers would be in closer contact with the Indians.

How does Indian policy in the progressive period relate to the national scene? Because of the complexities of progressivism and the incomplete nature of scholarship on Indian history, the answers must be somewhat tentative. The strongest condition, I believe, was the intense drive of reformers to place BIA employees under civil service. A second major connection was the progressives' faith in scientific administration which certainly can be seen in the economic programs and decentralization. Related to this is the trend toward a more secular outlook by the BIA which replaced the former emphasis on Christian civilization. Finally, Indian affairs tended to reflect the essentially moderate nature of general progressive reforms. In other words, BIA leaders and Indian reformers confidently believed that the present system of Indian affairs did not require radical change, but through the fine tuning of improved government personnel, economic programs, and scientific administration, the Indian problem would quickly disappear.

Indian affairs from World War I to the New Deal presents something of an irony. Most of us, I suspect, consider the 1920s as a

period of conservative reaction, more than faintly analogous to our present time. 1920s Indian affairs, however, was highly dynamic with endless squabbles between reformers and the BIA, important legislation, and the first challenge to assimilation.

Indian affairs of the 1920s centers around a young, white reformer named John Collier.¹⁵ A native of Georgia, Collier's education and his previous career as a social worker in New York City had created a philosophical outlook which viewed the industrial revolution, laissez faire, and conservative social Darwinism as disastrously dehumanizing and a blow against man's spiritual happiness and sense of community. What Collier favored was cultural pluralism. The young reformer regarded Indians and their life styles as valuable components of the total society. He saw Native American assimilation as a kind of cultural genocide which destroyed a precious and sacred way of life. Collier recognized that Indians would inevitably change, but he was repulsed by the coercion of past assimilation efforts.¹⁶

But Collier was something more than a latter day convert to the "noble savage" image. He placed great confidence in the employment of the scientific method in the study and solution of social problems. He mastered the complexities of Indian affairs, and this--plus his extraordinary propaganda skills--made him the dominant Indian reformer in the 1920s.

Again we face the problem that time does not permit a full examination of the 1920s, and I can only suggest that you read Kenneth Philp and Lawrence Kelly's excellent biographies on Collier, his autobiography, From Every Zenith, and other pieces which discuss more

specific topics. What I propose is to examine several important, and hopefully representative, events.

Collier's first contact with Indians occurred in 1920 when he observed the Christmas rites at Taos, New Mexico. His career in Indian reform started two years later when he learned about the Bursum bill on Pueblo lands. Introduced at the request of Interior Secretary Albert J. Fall, the Bursum bill attempted to solve long-standing disputes between Pueblos and whites who had settled on the Indians' grants after 1848. Despite their successful intrusions, whites were still concerned because they could not obtain clear titles. The Bursum measure clarified ownership but with a heavy bias by giving whites full titles if they could prove continuous possession for ten years before 1912.¹⁷

After learning about the Bursum bill in the fall of 1922 while visiting New Mexico, Collier organized the Council of All Pueblos in early November. A memorial from that group appeared in the New York Times, and this and related stories resulted in numerous protests and inquiries to the BIA. The bill was effectively killed later in November when Senator Borah asked for its recall. Collier continued his agitation into the next phase of the struggle, the writing of a new bill to settle the Pueblo land disputes. The Pueblo Lands Act, a compromise measure, finally passed in 1924.¹⁸ In the meantime, Collier had formed the American Indian Defense Association in 1923 to aid his future reform activities.

A much more significant issue developed in the early 1920s over oil explorations on the Navajo Reservation. Nearly everyone agreed that Indians were entitled to oil revenues from treaty reservation

lands, but a question arose over whether tribes should receive income from oil on reservation lands granted by executive orders. Some of you may not be aware that prior to 1918 presidents frequently had created reservations or enlarged existing reservations from the public domain by issuing such orders. Fall claimed that executive order lands remained under federal title and their surface rights were merely on loan to the tribes. In June, 1922 he ruled that oil leasing on executive order reservations came under the General Leasing Act of 1920. This had critical importance to the Navajos because most of their reservation consisted of executive order land, and the tribe would not derive any income from oil discoveries on such holdings.¹⁹

Collier's agitation was partly responsible for President Coolidge's veto of the Hayden bill of 1926 which would have given 37.5 per cent of oil revenues from executive order lands to states for building roads on reservations. In 1927 Congress passed legislation which guaranteed Indians' rights to all oil revenues, subject to some state taxes, and stipulated that the boundaries of executive order lands could only be changed by Congress.²⁰

The militant Collier during the 1920s also fought for Indians' religious freedom, criticized BIA education, tried to block the leasing of a power site on the Flathead Reservation to the Montana Power Company, attacked how Navajo oil money was spent, and complained that reimbursable loans had been used on unwise projects which often only benefited whites and shackled tribes with huge debts they could not pay.

Two major effects of reform criticisms became apparent by the mid-1920s. First, the BIA became uncertain and cautious about its

assimilationist policies. This was particularly evident in the slowing of allotment and in granting of fee simple titles to allottees. Thus, confidence in past policies faded, and new alternatives were not yet apparent.

Secondly, reform agitation prompted the federal government to begin several self-examinations of Indian affairs. The first example of the trend was in December 1923 when Fall's successor, Hubert Work, convened the Committee of One Hundred to evaluate Indian policy. The compromise resolutions adopted by the group reflected its mixed composition of old-line reformers, Collier supporters, assimilated Indians, anthropologists, and name personalities.²¹

In 1926 and 1927 the Institute for Government Research conducted probably the most important investigation of Indian conditions ever made. Lewis Meriam headed a commission of specialists in agriculture, law, education, health, family life, economics, and urban migration who toured reservations, boarding schools, and medical facilities throughout the West.²² In 1928 their findings and recommendations appeared in The Problem of Indian Administration. This lengthy report particularly criticized living conditions and curricula of Indian schools and the abject poverty and deplorable health conditions of reservations. Although the commission agreed with Collier's condemnation of allotment and forced assimilation, its basically moderate solutions consisted of adding a division of planning and administration within the BIA, upgrading field personnel, and increasing appropriations.²³

Through Senator William H. King of Utah, Collier, meantime, had secured a separate investigation in 1928, usually conducted through

hearings in the field by a subcommittee of the Senate Indian Affairs Committee from 1928 to 1943.²⁴ The investigation produced The Survey of Conditions of Indians in the United States which totals over 23,000 pages.²⁵ Collier controled the hearings in the early years, picking reservations to visit and questioning witnesses although he had no official position with the subcommittee.

The reform agitation and investigations led to some changes during the Rhoads-Scattergood administration of Hoover's presidency.²⁶ Included were educational reforms, new health facilities, some restructuring of the Washington Office, and increases in the field personnel. But the benevolent assimilationist policies of Commisssioner Charles J. Rhoads and Assistant Commissioner J. Henry Scattergood failed to satisfy Collier's strong demands for ending the allotment policy and cancellation of reimbursable loans, and during 1930 he renewed his attacks.²⁷

What explains the apparent irony of Indian reform during the conservative 1920s? One possible answer is that progressivism may have been stronger in the 1920s than is commonly believed, and, although the subject has not been studied per se, I strongly suspect that Collier's political ties were with the "left-over" progressive leaders. A better explanation is simply Collier himself, and the incredible energy, dedication, propaganda skills, and intelligence that he applied to reform.

Without question the New Deal era has received the most attention of any period of Indian affairs in this country.²⁸ Most of you will agree, I suspect, that when a fascinating person like Collier has spent a decade castigating the BIA and then becomes commissioner in

1933, the situation invites attention. It is not surprising that Collier's career has led to several monographs and dissertations and numerous articles. Since I have spent most of my research career on the New Deal period and presumably that is why I was invited here, let me drop the scholarly facade and render some personal observations.

As a naive graduate student, I saw Collier as a reformer of near heroic dimensions. I agreed completely with cultural pluralism and his autobiographic assessment that his enemies--conservative politicians, vested western interests, and misguided assimilated Indians--were indeed evil obstacles to the full achievement of his policies. My research since graduate school has hopefully produced a more balanced assessment.

Like most writers, I see the Indian Reorganization Act of 1934 as the keystone of Collier's efforts to translate cultural pluralism and his other beliefs into action.²⁹ Several of the provisions such as the creation of a revolving loan fund, recruitment of more Indians into the BIA, and scholarship aid worked reasonably well. Unfortunately, Collier's dreams of land consolidation and increasing the Indians' land base were largely defeated by congressional amendments, and the same was true of his attempt to create a special set of Indian courts. What remained largely intact was a process by which Indians could write charters for tribal government which generally operated as federal municipalities.

There were real problems, however, with self-government. The legislation itself required that many decisions must be approved by the Secretary of Interior. The new governments thus exercised control over internal tribal affairs and not over BIA budgets and personnel.

If the Navajos are any guide, Collier definitely manipulated the elections required to create self-government. On many reservations, mixed bloods seized control of the new tribal councils, excluded the fullbloods, and worsened existing factionalism. Finally, superintendents often controlled tribal councils, especially through job patronage.³⁰

Collier's unqualified successes, as I see it, were usually related to his executive lobbying. Although the regular BIA budgets were reduced after 1933, Collier more than offset such cuts by tapping funds from emergency programs such as the CCC, PWA, and WPA. Collier developed a special rapport with Secretary of Agriculture Henry Wallace which allowed the BIA to enjoy technical expertise that it could never have afforded otherwise. New schools, hospitals, irrigation systems, and conservation work all brought money and jobs to reservations, and it is easy to see why some older Indians today view the New Deal not as a time of depression but of prosperity.

In fairness, Collier faced formidable obstacles. Older BIA workers and assimilated Indians condemned cultural pluralism as a return to the blanket. Fullbloods regarded land consolidation as a threat to the only security they had, their allotments. Such New Deal policies as terminating white leases on reservation lands, buying marginal lands with emergency program funds, and, in general, defending Indians' well being offended white vested interests and contributed to Collier's problems with western congressional leaders.

The relationships between Collier's policies and the New Deal are rather obvious. The early Roosevelt administration was a time of experimentation and innovation, and only in such an atmosphere could

Collier and his ideas win acceptance. Later, after Roosevelt began to lose political control, Collier suffered his worst problems with both Indian and white opponents.

Collier left office in 1945, and the period from then to the 1960s is generally known as termination-relocation. Collier's successor, William A. Brophy, ill during much of his commissionership, mainly concerned himself with decentralizing Indian administration by establishing district field offices. While Brophy was on sick leave in 1947, Assistant Commissioner William Zimmerman, Jr. appeared before a House committee and presented a plan for a staged reduction of federal Indian services based on such criteria as each tribe's acculturation, economic condition, willingness to accept the changes, and the ability of state governments to assume federal services.³¹ Although Zimmerman later denied any intention of starting a major change in federal-Indian relations, his plan became a blueprint for exactly that. Certainly, Dillon S. Myer, named commissioner in 1950, strongly advocated a policy of withdrawal and even termination of federal services.³²

Actual termination, however, was delayed until the Eisenhower administration. House Concurrent Resolution no. 108 approved in August 1953 strongly endorsed termination and called for the Secretary of Interior to supply legislative recommendations on carrying out the new policy.³³ Public Law 280, approved later the same month, authorized state control of civil and criminal law over most reservations in California, Minnesota, Nebraska, Oregon, and Wisconsin.³⁴ Between 1954 and 1962, Congress approved twelve bills which terminated ties between the federal government and Indian

tribes. The most important groups affected were the Menominees of Wisconsin and the Klamaths of Oregon. Both tribes held valuable timber stands, and the complex disposition of their tribal assets aroused tremendous criticisms.³⁵

Termination brought into question the basic tenets of American Indian affairs because it dealt with constitutional, treaty, and statutory obligations that the federal government had fulfilled since the nation's founding. To its supporters, termination offered the Indian freedom from government responsibilities which imposed burdens on Indians that many were unprepared to assume.

Relocation, very briefly, was virtually a corollary to termination. The program started in the late 1940s as a means of recruiting Indians for seasonal labor, but in 1954 the emphasis changed to the permanent transfer of reservation inhabitants to urban centers. In this later phase, the BIA actively recruited individuals, transported them to major cities, funded vocational training, and then placed them in jobs. Particularly in the early years, relocation suffered from severe problems. Relocated Indians found it difficult to adjust to the demands of urban life, did not know how or were too timid to apply for such social services as unemployment and health care, and usually ended up either in urban destitution or returned to their reservation totally demoralized. Ironically, official relocation programs account for only about twenty-five percent of the Indians who migrated to urban centers since World War II, and scholars have done little work on the large majority of Indians who moved to cities on their own.³⁶

The scholarship on termination-relocation has not developed as fully as that on the New Deal, but it is gradually maturing. One monograph, three dissertations, and several articles have been completed so far, and Donald L. Fixico now has an excellently researched book in press.³⁷ I read Mr. Fixico's study in manuscript about a year ago, and I believe I am correct in saying that he views termination-relocation as an expression of several broader national forces of postwar American. Kenneth Philp has taken a somewhat different but not contradictory view by linking the new policies to the failures of the Collier administration.³⁸

The Red Power phase of Indian affairs which developed in the 1960s is in many ways even more fascinating than the 1920s reforms and the Indian New Deal. Certainly it offers drama with the rise of the National Indian Youth Council and the American Indian Movement, numerous demonstrations and marches, the seizure of Alcatraz, fishing and hunting rights controversies in the Northwest and upper Midwest, the trashing of the BIA building, and Wounded Knee II. Moreover, federal programs of the Johnson and Nixon administrations were often quite innovative, permitting a surprising degree of Indian participation, and offering new federal social and legal services which broke the BIA's traditional monopoly on such activities. Obvious ties existed between Red Power and the Black civil rights movement, but the parallels, I suspect, dealt more with tactics than goals.³⁹

Unfortunately, we are too close to these events and trends to understand them fully, we lack an adequate time lapse to judge their effects properly, and we await a new generation of graduate students

needed to conduct the interviews and to study the mass of records that will give us a sound understanding of the Red Power period.

1. The only overall treatment of twentieth century Indians is James S. Olson and Raymond Wilson, Native Americans in the Twentieth Century (Provo, Utah, 1984). Francis Paul Prucha, "American Indian Policy in the Twentieth Century," Western Historical Quarterly, 15 (January 1984), 5-18 offers a general appraisal of the field, suggests several studies that are needed, and discusses various problems of the field.
2. Reservations obviously predate the 1850s, but the general federal policy of creating such units is associated with Commissioner Luke Lea and the early 1850s. See Francis Paul Prucha, The Great Father: The United States Government and the American Indians, 2 vols. (Lincoln, Nebraska, 1984), 1: 324-328. For the origins of reservations in California, see ibid., 1: 380-392. Robert Trennert, Alternative to Extinction: Federal Indian Policy and the Beginnings of the Reservation System, 1846-51 (Philadelphia: 1975) assesses the background of the reservation policy.
3. For a copy of the legislation, see 24 United States Statutes 388-391.
4. Obviously, a great deal of literature exists on the reform background, the legislative history, and the effects of the General Allotment Act. For a summary of the subject, see Prucha, The Great Father, 2: 659-686. Although now dated, Loring Benson Priest, Uncle Sam's Stepchildren: The Reformation of United States Indian Policy, 1865-1887 (New Brunswick, 1942) is still useful for understanding the reformers' influences. In a different approach to the subject, Leonard A. Carlson, Indians, Bureaucrats, and Land, The Dawes Act and the Decline of Indian

- Farming (Westport, Conn., 1981) combines economic development theory with quantitative data to substantiate his new perspectives on the effects of allotment.
5. Congress revised the General Allotment Act several times after 1887, usually through amendments to appropriation bills. Leasing and other changes are discussed in Delos S. Otis, The Dawes Act and the Allotment of Indian Lands, ed. Francis Paul Prucha (Norman, Oklahoma, 1973).
 6. The relationship between general progressive reforms and Indian affairs has never been adequately treated. John F. Berens, "Old Campaigners, New Realities: Indian Policy Reform in The Progressive Era, 1900-1912," Mid-America: An Historical Review 59 (January 1977), 51-64, offers an introduction of the subject up to Wilson's administration. Hazel W. Hertzberg, The Search for an American Indian Identity: Modern Pan-Indian Movements (Syracuse, 1971) is an important study of educated Indians and their involvement in the Society of the American Indian. The writings of Francis Leupp, commissioner from 1905 to 1909, take a very optimistic view of Indian affairs. See especially The Indian and His Problem (New York, 1910). The most useful appraisal to date is Frederick E. Hoxie, A Final Promise: The Campaign to Assimilate the Indians, 1880-1920 (Lincoln, 1984).
 7. 32 United States Statutes 275.
 8. 34 United States Statutes 182-183; Prucha, The Great Father, 2: 875-877.
 9. Leupp, The Indian and His Problem, 68-69.

10. 36 United States Statutes 855-863.
11. Leupp, The Indian and His Problem, 155-159.
12. Prucha, The Great Father, 2: 770-772.
13. The competency commissions' work is discussed in Janet McDonald, "The Disintegration of the Indian Estate: Indian Land Policy, 1913-1929" (Ph.D. dissertation, Marquette University, 1980).
14. Clearly the most favored of the "new superintendents" was William T. Shelton, superintendent of the San Juan agency on the Navajo Reservation. Shelton's typescript article, "Civilizing the Navajo," (February 1913) describes his activities in education and irrigation. Shelton's dictatorial methods, however, were legendary and led to two uprisings. For a copy of his article, see Box 40/folder 1 of the Warren K. Moorhead Papers (Mss. Collection 106) at the Ohio Historical Society.
15. Collier's career has been studied in Kenneth R. Philp, John Collier's Crusade for Indian Reform, 1920-1954 (Tucson, 1977). Lawrence C. Kelly, The Assault on Assimilation, John Collier and the Origins of Indian Policy Reform (Albuquerque, 1983) discusses Collier's life to 1927. Collier's autobiography, From Every Zenith, A Memoir and Some Essays on Life and Thought (Denver, 1963), is partisan but important in understanding his motivations.
16. Collier's philosophy is discussed in the works previously cited. Stephen J. Kunitz's essay, "The Social Philosophy of John Collier," Ethnohistory 18 (Summer 1971), 213-219 is an insightful summary. See also Frederick J. Stefon, "The Indian's Zarathustra: An Investigation into the Philosophical Roots of John Collier's Indian

- New Deal Educational and Administrative Policies," (Part II) Journal of Ethnic Studies 11 (Winter 1984), 28-45.
17. The Bursum bill and the reform agitation which followed its introduction are covered in detail in Kelly, The Assault on Assimilation, 213-254.
 18. For the various revisions and final provisions of the legislation, see ibid., 295-300.
 19. The highly complex subject of oil revenues on executive order reservation lands is thoroughly discussed in Lawrence C. Kelly, The Navajo Indians and Federal Indian Policy 1900-1935 (Tucson, 1968), 37-101.
 20. Ibid., 92-93, 99-103.
 21. Prucha, The Great Father, 2: 807-808.
 22. Meriam's field letters are sometimes more revealing than the commission's report. See Donald L. Parman, ed., "Lewis Meriam's Letters during the Survey of Indian Affairs, 1926-1927 (Part I)," Arizona and the West 24 (Fall 1982), 253-280. For Part II, see ibid., (Winter 1982), 341-370.
 23. The Problem of Indian Administration (Baltimore, 1928). Donald T. Critchlow, "Lewis Meriam, Expertise, and Indian Reform," The Historian 43 (May 1981), 325-344 is very helpful in discussing Meriam's efforts to institute reforms in the BIA after the commission filed its report.
 24. Prucha, The Great Father, 2: 812.
 25. The Survey offers an unusually rich source of information for the

many reservations and tribes on which the subcommittee held hearings. See "Survey of Conditions of the Indians in the United States," Hearings before a Subcommittee of the Committee on Indian Affairs, United States Senate, 70th Congress to 78th Congress (1928-1943).

26. The phrase, "Rhoads-Scattergood administration," is used because Assistant Commissioner J. Henry Scattergood took an unusually active role.
27. Collier, From Every Zenith, 148-156 gives his assessment of the "False Dawn" of the Rhoads-Scattergood administration, but this should be balanced with materials in Philp's biography.
28. In addition to the previously cited works by Kelly, Philp, and Collier, several other books deal with aspects of the New Deal. See Donald L. Parman, The Navajos and the New Deal (New Haven, 1976); Graham D. Taylor, The New Deal and American Indian Tribalism: The Administration of the Indian Reorganization Act, 1934-45 (Lincoln, 1980); Laurence M. Hauptman, The Iroquois and the New Deal (Syracuse, 1981); and Robert F. Schrader, The Indian Arts and Crafts Board: An Aspect of New Deal Indian Policy (Albuquerque, 1983).
29. 48 United States Statutes 984-988. Prucha, The Great Father, 2: 954-963 provides a summary of the original bill, its legislative history, and the final measure.
30. Taylor, The New Deal and American Indian Tribalism contains a full discussion of the formation and operation of tribal governments during the period. Lawrence C. Kelly, "The Reorganization Act: The Dream and the Reality," Pacific

- Historical Review 44 (August 1975), 291-312 is a critical assessment of the measure, especially the number of Indians who came under its provisions.
31. Prucha, The Great Father, 2: 1026.
 32. For a sketch on Myer, see Patricia K. Ourada, "Dillon Seymour Myer, 1950-53," in Robert Kvasnicka and Herman J. Viola, eds., The Commissioners of Indian Affairs, 1824-1977 (Lincoln, 1979), 293-299.
 33. 67 United States Statutes B132.
 34. 67 United States Statutes 588-590.
 35. The Menominees' termination is discussed in Nickolas C. Perloff, Menominee Drums: Tribal Termination and Restoration, 1954-1974 (Norman, 1982), while the Klamath's experiences are dealt with in Theodore Stern, The Klamath Tribe: A People and Their Reservation (Seattle, 1965).
 36. Historians have generally neglected relocation, particularly the "unofficial" migration. See Prucha, The Great Father, 2: 1079-1084 for a summary. Kenneth R. Philp, "Stride toward Freedom: The Relocation of Indians to Cities, 1952-1960," Western Historical Quarterly 16 (April 1985), 175-190 suggests that relocation developed from the failure of the New Deal to improve reservation conditions, and the policy was not the sole work of BIA policy makers. Philp also maintains that relocation administrators always had more applicants than they could fund. His article additionally provides a well documented summary of the relocation program.
 37. Fixico's study will be entitled Termination and Relocation:

Federal Indian Policy, 1945-1960 and will be published by the University of New Mexico Press. Additional studies include Larry W. Burt, Tribalism in Crisis: Federal Indian Policy, 1953-1961 (Albuquerque, 1982) and Larry J. Hasse, "Termination and Assimilation: Federal Indian Policy, 1943 to 1961," (Ph.D. dissertation, Washington State University, 1974).

38. Kenneth R. Philp, "Termination: A legacy of the Indian New Deal," Western Historical Quarterly 14 (April 1983), 165-180.
39. Nearly all the published materials on the Red Power phase are polemical, and much work needs to be done before the events can be assessed objectively. The author's "American Indians and the Bicentennial," New Mexico Historical Review, 51 (July 1976), 233-249 is an introductory attempt to deal with the subject but utilized some archival materials. Stan Steiner, The New Indians (New York, 1968) is a popular treatment which captures the attitudes of the early Indian protestors but could not deal with many of the later and more militant events. Vine Deloria, Jr., Custer Died for Your Sins: An Indian Manifesto (New York, 1970) and his later writings offer a witty and caustic assessment of recent Indian affairs. Alvin Josephy, Jr., ed., Red Power: The American Indian's Fight for Freedom (New York, 1971) provides a series of well chosen pieces. The same author has treated land, water, and fishing rights, as well as other matters, in Now That the Buffalo's Gone (New York, 1982). Prucha's bibliography in The Great Father, 2: 1254-1257 lists other important sources.

"The Indian War in Academics: Classroom Application
of Twentieth-Century American Indian History"

Donald L. Fixico

University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee

Misconceptions and inaccurate images of "savage" Indians have created a need to correct information about Native Americans, especially in the twentieth century. Historical stereotypes have influenced the public to view Americans in a regressive sense, giving them very little credit for participating in major historical events. This view is far from correct since Indian Americans have been and are involved in these happenings, and they have influenced the development of the mainstream culture.

The Native American experience is treated separately as American Indian history, which accounts for the little representation Native Americans have in U.S. history textbooks. Actually, integrating materials about Native Americans since 1900 into a U.S. History course can be done in multiple ways. Exploring these ways is the objective of this presentation.

First, we should realize that American Indians are a people, who reside in separate communities, that possess distinct identities from other tribal groups. Like the many diverse nations in European history, the Indian populace was divided into nations. In fact, ancestral Indian America was more complex because of the larger geographic area and existence of more numerous tribal nations and subgroups called bands. This statement still holds true today.

Furthermore, Indians are distinctively different socially, politically, and culturally from other American minorities and the general population. Comprehending the magnitude of these differences is paramount in the task of the assignment--introducing American Indian curriculum in a U.S. History course. To most educators and Americans, these differences are unnoticeable and obscured by the various accepted stereotypes and myths about American Indians. Ignorance of these differences has caused erroneous generalizations and misconceptions about Indian Americans.

If there were fewer differences and more similarities between Indians and mainstream individuals, then there would be no logical need for the approximately 125 American Indian studies programs and departments at colleges and universities throughout the nation. Since their inception during the civil rights activism on college campuses in the late 1960s, Native American studies programs and departments have been instrumental in demonstrating the importance of curriculum regarding Indian Americans. The history of American Indians, their cultures, and philosophies of the western hemisphere co-existed with the same fundamental elements of the eastern hemisphere until they met and conflicted.

We should keep in perspective that this nation consists of a great diversity of various ethnic and racial groups. This is our forte, our strength, our uniqueness. Americans are led to believe that they are assimilated into a melting pot--a false assumption. No homogeneous American culture exists, nor can we imagine what an "American" even looks like. Rather, the American population is represented by various minorities according to race, ethnicity, economics, and regionalism.

The issue here today is that American Indians basically live a parallel co-existence with the American mainstream. (It should be noted as well that many Indians have chosen to become a part of the dominant society, but a thriving Indian identity persists.) Never has the Indian population been assimilated into the American mainstream even though federal policies have attempted to desegregate Indian communities for the strict purpose of assimilation.

During the course of Indian-government relations, Indian tribal and individual rights were threatened by federal legislation, executive orders, and court decisions. As the years passed, Native Americans had to start protecting their own rights. Educators should be cognizant of this point and enlighten students of this unique federal-Indian relationship. In this century, tribal governments, court systems, and government assistance have helped American Indians maintain their separate identity and special legal status.

One obvious method of teaching about American Indians in the twentieth century is developing an entire course on the subject. This approach is cited because major events that have affected Indian history are perceived differently in American history. One might assume that people are basically the same and therefore would respond in a similar manner. In the case of American Indians, however, the presumption is almost erroneous. We can gain important insight into the differences between Indians and the mainstream, yet we blindly strive to look for the similarities.

Perhaps a series of cross-cultural, cross-political, and cross-social approaches can be taken to better understand Indian Americans in U.S. history. Thus, rather than by comparisons, we can

learn most about this subject from the contrasts of American Indians and their cultures versus the mainstream. In addition to concentrating on the factual contrasts, we should scrutinize the social and cultural dynamics that are exchanged in Indian-white relations. Please bear in mind that Indian peoples and their cultures also impacted the Anglo-American mainstream.

First, we need to comprehend the course of Indian-white relations and federal-tribal relations. Professor Donald Parman has related to us the central theme of assimilating Indians into the mainstream as the undercurrent of federal intentions in this century. In this light, we shall scrutinize the Indian minority's relationship to the mainstream majority.

In response to reservations and allotments during the late 1800s and after the turn of the century, Indian rural life can be compared to the American agrarian lifestyle. The American farmer was the nation's backbone and the farming family valued the land. In a different light, Indians also valued the land, according to their special tribal outlook. Pointing out the differences of these land values tells us that the deep farmer-land and Indian-land relationships were very much a part of the heritages of both people.

For my own benefit, Professors Lawana Trout and Herbert Hoover have enlightened me on the depth of the white farmer-land relationship. The farmer's love for the land is of a similar degree of commitment to the land that traditional Indians have expressed, but these two relationships are quite different from each other. Simply put, the white farmer worked the land, developing it to produce crops to feed his family, and to turn a profit. In a different manner, the

traditional Indian utilized the land's natural resources to feed his family, but capitalistic profits were irrelevant to his outlook on life. Social and cultural advancements were higher priorities for survival.

It should be noted that life on reservations and on allotments was fundamentally different from life on the farm. The key here is the different assortment of values. Basic values established norms and set certain standards of expectation in Indian societies. The American mainstream has falsely assumed that Indians live by low standards, but in actuality Indians have a different set of values. In the American capitalistic society, the white farmer depends on his harvested crops to earn his livelihood and to make a profit for the "supply and demand" market. Conversely, the traditional Indian depended on the natural resources of the earth for his livelihood and his surplus of hunted game or harvested crops was shared in the communal society. This scheme of life continued until the reservation system brought an end to this sharing.

The time of the Dawes Allotment Act during the late nineteenth century meant "change." Mainstream scholars might refer to this period as "reform" as a result of the Industrial Revolution and progressivism that followed. But in the eyes of Indians, nothing had improved. Professor Parman properly calls these years a time of transformation. But for Indian allottees, it was a time of disastrous change that nearly destroyed their native way of life.

A parallel for discussing transformation involving Indians and land and the mainstream and land is searching for similarities. Such likenesses would include the Homestead Act of 1862 and the Dawes

Allotment Act of 1887. From a hunter-warrior livelihood, the Dawes Act intended Indians to become individualistic farmers on their reservation lands. Meanwhile, the white American was transforming from an agrarian to an urbanite in the "big city." Such reform was the result of the American Industrial Revolution, and it should be noted that new ideas from this period shaped federal Indian relations.

Professor Parman explained that the intent of the Dawes Allotment Act was to prepare American Indians for U.S. citizenship. He informs us that Native Americans were not properly prepared for the full responsibilities of allotment which entailed absolute ownership of land. This next step of citizenship proved unrealistic, and led to the postponement of such ownership, i.e., the Bruke Act of 1906. Such a parallel to U.S. history is non-existent. (Perhaps federal assistance to the black minority through the Freedman's Bureau following the Civil War and the Emancipation Proclamation is one.)

Developing Indian lands and their natural resources is analogous perhaps, to the conservation movement initiated by the Theodore Roosevelt administration after the turn of the century. Both attempts, at least, focused on land. The development of land resources did not succeed in the Indians' case. Of utmost importance, we should keep in mind that native peoples perceived their environment differently. Philosophically, a general "oneness" with nature prohibited the Indians from actively utilizing natural resources like the white man.

Professor Parman may dispute this view since he has cited the scientific administration assistance that involved Indians with irrigation projects, ranching, livestock, and so forth. However, it

is ironic that during the period of progressivism and the "Golden" or "Roaring 1920s," the nation enjoyed an unstable prosperity while the Indian populace suffered a poor livelihood, according to mainstream standards. Indian ranching, livestock husbandry, and irrigation proved to be disappointing and disastrous in most cases.

Prosperity for Indians never came. Instead, the Great Depression crushed the nation and World War II followed within several years. In examining Indian livelihood during these years, a humorous irony is observed. On the whole, the Depression did not have a significant impact on the Indians because they had always been poor.

The lesson to be learned here is that while American citizens survived in Hooverville communities, Indians coped with their daily circumstances through the communal systems on reservations and on allotments. For instance, accepting moral and material support from one's kinship system and community neighbors reinforced one's efforts to persevere.

Fortunately for Native Americans, John Collier, the Commissioner of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, was pro-Indian. Collier motivated a massive reform effort to uplift the general Indian livelihood. His approach of "cultural pluralism" as Dr. Parman has informed us enabled numerous legislative measures and government programs to aid Indian people. Perhaps the best comparison of Indian history and American history can be formulated during the period of the twentieth century. The Collier Indian New Deal and President Franklin Roosevelt's New Deal program sought to reform existing conditions through federal assistance that had never been tried before.

The parallel existence of Indians and mainstream America can best be studied during times of crises. During such catastrophes as the Depression, World War I, and World War II, Korea and Vietnam in the twentieth century parallel paths of Indians and the mainstream have intersected. Here, we can examine the responses of Indians and the mainstream to these experiences.

During World War II the nation, including Indians, responded with patriotism. Often, classroom materials are carried away with the evilness of Adolph Hitler and Nazism, or the heroics of Allied leaders like Generals George Patton, Omar Bradley, and Dwight Eisenhower. Accounts to add to the European and Pacific campaigns could include the heroics of individual performances by Jack Montgomery, an Oklahoma Cherokee, and Ernest Childers, an Oklahoma Creek. Both men earned Congressional Medals of Honor, the nation's highest military award. Most people are not aware that the warrior tradition persisted among many tribes whose young men eagerly joined the Army (22,000)--possibly their last chance to prove themselves to be warriors.

After World War II, two policies--termination and relocation--occurred. By understanding Eisenhower conservatism in U.S. history, we can understand both American society in the 1950s and the basis for the Republican administration's termination of Indian-federal trust relations and termination of Indian assistance programs. This decade was one of euphemistic nationalism, patriotism, and conservatism that can be labeled Eisenhowerism. The Republican vision to create a strong, educated, and prosperous society called for the conformity of Native Americans and other minorities to the newly established norms of the dominant society.

Relocation can best be comprehended in conjunction with the rise of middle-class America during the 1950s and 1960s. During this score of years, Native Americans became more like Anglo-Americans as they migrated to urban areas via the relocation program. In essence, they became materialistic and did not want to share anymore. For materialistic gain, they elected to forego their traditional values.

Urban problems for Native Americans became more urgent during the turbulent 1960s. Like the New Deal period, this is an excellent period for drawing parallels between Indian America and mainstream America. Protest marches, sit-ins, and riots affected both Indians and the mainstream, enabling us to draw parallels. The creation of Red Power corroborated Indian protests for treaty rights, halting termination, and federal paternalism. By understanding the other power movements--Black Power, Brown Power, and even Gray Power--we can learn about the dynamics of political activism between Red Power and the others.

The militant years of the 1970s include the Broken Treaties March of 1972, Alcatraz takeover in 1969, Wounded Knee of 1973, Fish-ins of the 1960s and the seizure the Bureau of Indian Affairs Building in 1972. Indian activism of this nature has no mainstream parallel in recent history. Campus riots like Kent State, labor strikes, protest marches, and other anti-establishment activism had different motives from Indian concerns.

Since the Indian Self-Determination policy was signed into law by President Gerald Ford in 1975, we can best understand self-determination as possibly the final phase of federal assistance. By understanding motives of Republican administrations since the early 1970s, we can

see a distinct parallel of Republican Indian policy during the 1950s. Hence, the popular phrase of "Getting out of the Indian business" can be altered to "Let the tribes get the federal government out of the Indian business."

Contemporary issues like autonomy, self-determination, and tribal powers perhaps can best be understood by comparing them with recent American foreign policy. Indian communities continue to exist like third-world nations today, who depend upon the United States, while maintaining separate identities. They are, as Vine Deloria Jr. and Clifford Lytle have called them, Nations Within.¹

We should be reminded that Indians today find and maintain their individual Indian identities in their communities. Such groups are connected by generations of kinship networks. Such individuals are more traditional in their outlook than their contemporary counterparts (self-assimilated Indians) who see themselves as a part of the American mainstream. Nevertheless, their pasts combined as a generic Indian history express a separate Indian identity that parallels American history.

-
1. Vine Deloria Jr. and Clifford Lytle. The Nations Within: The Past and Future of American Indian Sovereignty (New York, 1984)

SYLLABUS

"HISTORY OF AMERICAN INDIANS FROM 1887 TO THE PRESENT"

Instructor - Dr. Fixico

Course Description: This course will cover the history of the American Indian in North America from 1887 to Indian affairs under the Reagan Administration. In addition to the events affecting Indian people as they entered the 20th century, a variety of topics will be covered such as Indian rights, education, health, stereotypes, self-concepts, mixed-bloods, Indian women, reservation life, urban life, leadership, and federal policies up to self-determination under New Federalism in the 1980s.

Required Texts: (all books available in paperback.)

Charles Alexander Eastman, From the Deep Woods to Civilization. (orig. edn., Boston, 1916)

N. Scott Momaday, House Made of Dawn. (New York, 1969)

James S. Olsen and Raymond Wilson, Native Americans in the Twentieth Century. (Provo, UT, 1984)

Peter Iverson, ed., The Plains Indians of the Twentieth Century. (Norman, OK, 1985)

Cliff Trafzer, ed., American Indian Identity, Today's Changing Perspectives. (San Diego, CA, 1985)

Grading System: There will be two exams, and a final exam. The three exams will be based on the lectures and required readings in coordination with the syllabus. Hence, there will be no final comprehensive exam. To help in preparing for the exams, a study guide will be provided prior to each examination date. No research paper is required (but you may be asked to do one to substitute for a make-up exam). Each exam will count one-third of the final grade with attendance taken into consideration.

LECTURES AND READING ASSIGNMENTS

Jan. 14	Introduction covering course objectives and exams.	<u>Native Americans in the Twentieth Century</u> pp. 1-25 <u>American Indian Identity</u> Ch. 1
Jan. 16	Film - "Images of Indians"	<u>Native</u> pp. 29-44 <u>Identity</u> Ch. 4
Jan. 21	Life on the Reservations in the late 1800s	<u>Native</u> pp. 49-66 <u>Plains Indians of the Twentieth Century</u> Ch. 1
Jan. 23	The Dawes Land Allotment Act of 1887	<u>Native</u> pp. 67-74 <u>Plains</u> Ch. 2

Jan. 28	Film - "The New Indians"	
Jan. 30	Ghost Dance & The Prophet Wovoka	<u>Plains</u> Ch. 3
Feb. 4	Chitto Harjo & The Crazy Snake Rebellion	<u>Native</u> pp. 88-91
Feb. 6	Lake Mohonk Conferences & Bureaucrats	<u>From Deep Woods to Civilization</u> start reading
Feb. 11	Refomers & Church Groups	<u>Native</u> pp. 79-90
Feb. 13	Federal Indian Policy in the late 1800s Film - "How the West Was Won"	
Feb. 18	The "Winters' Doctrine" & Indian Water Rights Critiques Due - <u>From Deep Woods</u> (Optional).	<u>Plains</u> Ch. 4
Feb. 20	Class Discussion - <u>From the Deep Woods to Civilization.</u>	
Feb. 25	<u>FIRST EXAM.</u>	
Feb. 27	Warriors in World War I & Progressivism	<u>Native</u> pp. 92-99
Mar. 4	Anthropologists & Ishi, The Last Wild Indian Film - "Ishi in Two Worlds"	<u>Native</u> pp. 107-09
Mar. 6	Exploitating the Guardianship Business & The Osage Murders for Oil	<u>House Made of Dawn</u> start reading
Mar. 9-16	SPRING BREAK.	
Mar. 18	Courts Declaring "Competent" Indians, U.S. Citizenship Act of 1924 & The Meriam Report	<u>Native</u> pp. 100-03
Mar. 20	Collier Era of 1930s--The Indian New Deal	<u>Native</u> pp. 107-09 <u>Plains</u> Ch. 5
Mar. 25	The Indian Reorganization Act of 1934	<u>Native</u> pp. 109-19
Mar. 27	The Oklahoma Reorganization Act of 1936	<u>Native</u> pp. 121-28 <u>Identity</u> Ch. 3
Apr. 1	The Alaska Native Reorganization Act of 1936	<u>Native</u> pp. 121-28 <u>Identity</u> Ch. 2
Apr. 3	American Indians in World War II Critiques Due - <u>House Made of Dawn</u> (Optional) Class Discussion - <u>House Made of Dawn.</u>	<u>Native</u> pp. 126-28 <u>Plains</u> Ch. 6
Apr. 8	<u>SECOND EXAM.</u>	
Apr. 10	The Indian Claims and Commission	<u>Native</u> pp. 131-42

Apr. 15	Eisenhowerism and the Termination Years	<u>Native</u> pp. 133-46 <u>Plains</u> Ch. 7
Apr. 17	Relocation Program-Indian Removal to Cities	<u>Native</u> pp. 147-52 <u>Plains</u> Ch. 8
Apr. 22	Civil Rights & Red Power!	<u>Native</u> pp. 157-62 <u>Plains</u> Ch. 10 <u>Identity</u> Ch. 5
Apr. 24	Nixon Reform Years & Indian Militancy	<u>Native</u> pp. 170-75 <u>Identity</u> Ch. 7
Apr. 29	Energy Crisis' Demands on Reservations' Natural Resources	<u>Native</u> pp. 181-93 <u>Plains</u> Ch. 9 <u>Identity</u> Ch. 6
May 1	Tribal Governments Today & Tomorrow's Indian Leaders	<u>Native</u> pp. 209-19 <u>Plains</u> Ch. 11
May 3	<u>FINAL EXAM.</u>	

LIBRARY BOOKS ON RESERVE

The following books have been placed on reserve in the library. They may be useful for clarifying your notes taken from lectures and preparing for the exams.

- William Coffer, Phoenix: The Decline and Rebirth of the Indian People (New York, 1979)
 Larry Burt, Tribalism in Crisis, Federal Indian Policy, 1953-1961 (Albuquerque, 1982)
 Angie Debo, A History of the Indians of the United States (Norman, OK, 1970)
 Arrell M. Gibson, The American Indian, Prehistory to Present (Lexington, MA, 1980)
 William T. Hagan, American Indians (Chicago, 1961)
 Alvin Josephy Jr., Red Power, the American Indian's Fight for Freedom (New York, 1971)
 Graham Taylor, The New Deal and American Indian Tribalism (Lincoln, NE, 1980)
 S. Lyman Tyler, A History of Federal Indian Policy (Washington, D.C., 1973)

Indians in United States

Civil Rights History

W. Richard West, Jr. and Kevin Gover

Fried, Frank, Harris, Shriver and Jacobson.

INTRODUCTION

Like other ethnic minorities, American Indians have been subjected to discrimination by both governmental and private entities throughout the history of the United States. Unlike other minorities, however, Indian people's views of their rights under law extend beyond those expected by their fellow citizens, to include a wide range of preferences, immunities and prerogatives that arise not from their status as a racial minority but, rather, from their status as citizens of tribal governments.

The "civil rights" of Indian people are best understood, therefore, by separating them into two broad categories. The first category deals with those matters that we ordinarily think of as "civil rights": the right to be free from discrimination on the basis of race, the right to vote, the right to due process of law, freedom of speech and religion, etc. And in the case of Indian people, we are concerned not only with the constitutional limitations on the power of state and federal governments, but also with limitations on the power of tribal governments. The second broad category includes the rights and disabilities of Indians as members of tribal bodies politic. The United States has established legal preferences, immunities and disabilities that run directly to individual Indians as well as rights and immunities that flow through the tribal government.

In both cases, though, it is tribal citizenship that creates the right or immunity.

INDIANS, THE CONSTITUTION AND TREATIES

The relationship between the United States and the Indians has been described by the Supreme Court as "anomalous and complex." Many of these anomalies and complexities will be seen in this chapter. The Constitution as originally adopted mentioned Indians twice. Under Article I, "Indians not taxed" were excluded from state populations for purposes of apportioning taxes and representatives in Congress among the states. Also under Article I, Congress is accorded the power to "regulate commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes."

The implications of these provisions are twofold: (1) That Indians generally were not citizens of the United States or the states in which they resided, and (2) That Indian tribes were distinct political societies, relations with which were to be managed by the federal government. The manner in which the early leaders of the United States exercised their powers under the Constitution demonstrates these points. Congress' earliest enactments included several laws governing relationships with Indian tribes. Among the most significant were the Trade and Intercourse Acts, which required, among other things, that traders in Indian country be licensed by the federal government and that all sales, cessions or other dispositions of Indian land be approved by Congress. Also important were the numerous treaties with eastern Indian tribes that were submitted to the Senate for ratification.

The relationship between the United States and Indian tribes and people in these early years was explained by John Marshall, the first Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, in Cherokee Nation v. Georgia (1831) and Worcester v. Georgia (1832). Each case arose from disputes between the federal government and the State of Georgia regarding the Cherokee Nation. Much of the territory of the Cherokee Nation was within the borders of Georgia. Over the course of forty years, the United States had made treaties with the Cherokee Nation, each successive treaty reducing the Cherokee boundaries established by the previous treaty. Georgia was unhappy with the piecemeal erosion of Indian territory and with the immunity from state laws enjoyed by the Cherokees on their territory. The State enacted a series of laws having the effect of disavowing the rights of the Cherokees under their treaties with the United States.

Cherokee Nation v. Georgia arose from an original petition in the Supreme Court by the Cherokee Nation to have the Georgia laws declared void and unenforceable. The Court denied the petition on the ground that the Cherokee Nation was neither a "foreign nation" nor a "state" which could file an original petition in the Supreme Court under Article III of the Constitution. In his opinion denying the petition, however, Marshall took the opportunity to discuss at length the legal status of Indian governments:

The condition of the Indians in relation to the United States is, perhaps, unlike that of any two people in existence. In general, nations not owing a common allegiance, are foreign to each other. . . . But the relation of the Indians to the United States is marked by peculiar and cardinal distinctions which exist

nowhere else. The Indian Territory is admitted to compose a part of the United States. . . . They acknowledge themselves, in their treaties, to be under the protection of the United States; they admit that the United States shall have the sole and exclusive right of regulating the trade with them, and managing all their affairs as they think proper. . . . [I]t may well be doubted, whether those tribes which reside within the acknowledged boundaries of the United States can, with strict accuracy, be denominated foreign nations. They may, more correctly, perhaps, be denominated domestic dependent nations [T]hey are in state of pupillage; their relation to the United States resembles that of a ward to his guardian.

One year later, the issue of the validity of the Georgia laws came back to the Court. A white missionary, Samuel Worcester, defied Georgia's ban on non-Indians entering the Cherokee Nation and was arrested, tried and convicted. He appealed to the Supreme Court, arguing that the Georgia law was void because only federal law governed relations with the Cherokee Nation. Marshall again discussed at length the status of Indians:

The Indian nations had always been considered as distinct, independent political communities, retaining their original natural rights, as the undisputed possessors of the soil, from time immemorial The very term 'nation' so generally applied to them, means 'a people distinct from others.' The Constitution, by declaring treaties already made, as well as those to be made, to be supreme law of the land, has adopted and sanctioned the previous treaties with the Indian nations, and consequently admits their rank among those powers who are capable by making treaties. The words 'treaty' and 'nation' are words of our own language selected in diplomatic and legislative proceedings, by ourselves, having each a definite and well-understood meaning. We have applied them to Indians, as we have applied them to the other nations of the earth. They are applied to all in the same sense

The Cherokee Nation, then, is a distinct political community occupying its own territory, with boundaries accurately described, in which

the laws of Georgia can have no force, and which the citizens of Georgia have no right to enter, but, with the assent of the Cherokees themselves, or in conformity with treaties, and with the acts of congress. The whole intercourse between the United States and this nation is, by our constitution and laws, vested in the government of the United States.

These early formulations of the federal-Indian relationship would affect the civil rights of Indians in several profound ways. The most obvious is that Indian people, as citizens of "distinct political communities," were not citizens of the United States and, therefore, enjoyed none of the statutory and constitutional rights reserved to citizens. Their status as citizens of other nations also had the effect of exempting them from state laws that applied to all other residents of the states, at least so long as the Indians remained in their territories.

The tribes, however, were not "nations" in other respects. Their power to conduct relations with European powers, under Marshall's formulation, was surrendered when they came within the boundaries of the United States. So, too, was their control of the disposition of their lands. The title of Indian tribes to the lands they used and occupied was not the inviolable fee title of European and American governments. Instead, first the Europeans and then the American governments laid claim to the legal title of lands occupied by the Indians under the "discovery" doctrine. This doctrine held that the Indians held only a legal right of possession and that the "discovering" nation had the exclusive right to terminate the Indian right of possession either by agreement or conquest. The doctrine was developed by the Europeans to resolve their conflicting claims to territory in the New World, and was ratified as an element of American

jurisprudence by the Supreme Court in Johnson v. McIntosh (1823). The Court discussed the origins and contours of the doctrine, and seemed troubled by the plain implication that Indians were somehow inferior to other people in their legal rights. The Court could not reverse history, however, noting that:

Conquest gives a title which the courts of the conqueror cannot deny, whatever the private and speculative opinions of individuals may be, respecting the original justice of the claim which has been successfully asserted

However extravagant the pretension of converting the discovery of an inhabited country into conquest may appear; if the principle has been asserted in the first instance, and afterwards sustained; if a country has been acquired and held under it; if the property of the great mass of the community originates in it, it becomes the law of the land, and cannot be questioned. So, too, with respect to the concomitant principle, that the Indian inhabitants are to be considered merely as occupants, to be protected, indeed, while in peace, in the possession of their lands, but to be deemed incapable of transferring the absolute title to others. However this restriction may be opposed to natural right, and to the usages of civilized nations, yet, if it be indispensable to that system under which the country has been settled, and be adapted to the actual condition of the two people, it may, perhaps, be supported by reason, and certainly cannot be rejected by courts of justice.

This early recognition of a distinction between the natural rights--and therefore, the legal rights--of those who were Indian and those who were white is troubling in the abstract, and lays the intellectual groundwork for later violations of Indian rights. Marshall undoubtedly was correct that the time had long since passed for reevaluation of Indian rights to land. The title of every landowner in the country would have been clouded had the Court failed to acknowledge the discovery doctrine. Later courts, however, also

would yield uncritically to the proposition that the basic human rights of Indian people were somehow less than those of white people, even when the practicalities of the situation did not so demand.

Two other results of the early federal-Indian relationship are more subtle but no less profound. First, the right of the tribes to govern their internal affairs left tribal governments unencumbered by the restraints on governmental power contained in the Constitution. The result was that tribal governments were free to treat their citizens in ways that might be deemed unacceptable if done by state or federal governments, as will be discussed below. The second effect was that the United States would come to rely on Marshall's characterization of the federal-tribal relationship as similar to that of a guardian and his ward to justify policies and practices that crippled tribal governments for many years.

Marshall's description of the relationship between the United States and Indian nations was correct in theory but not in practice. Georgia refused to honor the Supreme Court's decree. Less than ten years after the Worcester decision, the so called Five Civilized Tribes of the Southern United States were forced from their ancestral homes through treaties procured by fraud and duress.

MANIFEST DESTINY -- WARFARE AND CONQUEST

The notion of manifest destiny dominated federal Indian policy for the rest of the nineteenth century. Warfare between the tribes and frontier settlers rendered civil rights inoperative during the middle years of the century. The legal rights of the tribes were

disregarded when they proved inconvenient and the legal rights of individual Indians were subsumed by the hostility of frontier settlers. The federal government made token attempts to protect Indian treaty rights but, as a practical matter, both the Indians and the white frontier populations were beyond its control. Whites and Indians on the frontier developed brutal and savage attitudes towards each other and engaged in vicious racial warfare. The ultimate victor in such conflict most often is unable to recapture its essential decency in its treatment of the vanquished after conquest. Such certainly was the case when incessant warfare and disease eliminated the military capacity of the tribes. Shortly after the Civil War, most of the tribes were confined to reservations and made almost entirely dependent upon the federal government.

In such a setting, of course, the rights theoretically accorded by law become virtually irrelevant. Despite dramatic developments in the field of civil rights generally, therefore, the rights of Indian people were not a subject of favorable attention between 1833 and 1883. The post-Civil War amendments to the Constitution, were revolutionary in their impact on civil rights, but had little impact on the condition of Indian people at the time.

Indians generally remained beyond the reach of state law throughout the period and, for this reason, "Indians not taxed" were excluded from the Fourteenth Amendment's formula for the allocation of representatives to Congress. The Fourteenth Amendment, in order to overturn the infamous Dred Scott decision, contained the following provision on citizenship:

All persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and of The State wherein they reside.

Although this provision clearly granted citizenship to newly-freed black slaves, it was held not to be a general grant of citizenship to Indians in Elk v. Wilkins (1884).

In the Elk case, an Indian resident of Omaha, having severed his relationship with his tribe, nonetheless was denied suffrage by state officials. The Supreme Court held that he was not a citizen under the Fourteenth Amendment:

Indians born within the territorial limits of the United States, members of, and owing immediate allegiance to, one of the Indian tribes . . . , although in a geographic sense born in the United States, are no more "born in the United States and subject to the jurisdiction thereof," within the meaning of the first section of the Fourteenth Amendment, than the children of subjects of any foreign state born within the domain of that government

Thus, because most Indians remained tribal citizens primarily, and because tribal citizenship was regarded as inconsistent with American citizenship, Indians were not entitled to the rights of citizens.

Significantly, many of the rights afforded by the post-Civil War amendments were granted to "persons" as opposed to "citizens." The states, therefore, were required to afford equal protection and due process to Indians as "persons" even though not required to provide the elective franchise and the equal privileges and immunities the Constitution now granted to "citizens." Indians were considered "persons" by American law and, in theory at least, were entitled to the constitutional protections available to "persons."

The Thirteenth Amendment's abolition of slavery did affect Indians, although not in the way one might expect. Slavery was quite widespread among the tribes, the slaves usually being captives from other tribes as well as whites and, more frequently, Mexicans. Such slavery, however, was not as systematic as that practiced in the American South. The Thirteenth Amendment ban on slavery was all-encompassing and applied to Indian tribes within the United States. The tribes most seriously affected were the Five Civilized Tribes. During their tenure in the southern United States, several of these tribes, most notably the Cherokees, adopted the practice of black slavery. In treaties made with these tribes after the Civil War, the practice was abolished and the freed slaves granted citizenship in the Indian nations. These "freedmen" bands continue to have representation in some tribal governments in eastern Oklahoma.

Another significant development of this era was the piecemeal granting of American citizenship to Indians of various tribes. This usually was done through treaty provisions allowing citizens of the tribe to renounce their tribal citizenship and receive an allotment of land from the tribal domain. The Dred Scott decision, interestingly, denied the federal government's power to naturalize black slaves, but approved federal power to naturalize Indians. Although provisions were included for optional American citizenship in many treaties, few Indians chose to renounce their tribal citizenship.

In these waning years of tribal independence, then, the civil rights of Indian people were not a topic of much discussion. Although Indians were theoretically guaranteed the rights of other "persons," frontier hostility between whites and Indians and the inability of the federal government to manage affairs on the frontier rendered these guarantees virtually meaningless.

Two significant developments, however, occurred in this era. The first was the granting of citizenship to Indians. Although few Indians would choose to become citizens, congressional power to grant such status to Indians and the Indians' innate capacity to be productive citizens were recognized and would form the basis for guaranteeing the civil rights of Indians in future years. Similarly, the post-Civil War amendments, though initially of little practical value to Indians, would be used in future years to defend Indians from racist assaults on their civil rights.

ASSIMILATION -- THE ALLOTMENT POLICY

By 1883, the United States faced a critical decision in its conduct of relations with the Indian nations. The military conquest of the tribes was complete, the surviving tribes were confined to reservations comprising only small fractions of their domains, and many Indians lived on government-furnished rations. In 1871, Congress had passed a law providing that future relations with the tribes would not be conducted by treaty, but, rather, by ordinary legislation approved by both houses.

The practical ability of the tribes to resist federal intrusion on their affairs having been destroyed, the exercise of federal power over Indians took an ugly turn. The federal-tribal relationship would be transformed from a solemn agreement between nations to that of a despotic guardian and a helpless ward. Ironically, Chief Justice Marshall's description of the federal-tribal relationship would be used to ratify that transformation.

Marshall had said that the federal-tribal relationship resembled that between a guardian and his ward. At the end of the nineteenth century, Congress and the courts took these words to heart. Increased federal intrusion into intra-tribal affairs was justified on the grounds that the tribes were dependent upon the United States for protection from hostile local populations. A telling example of this attitude is found in United States v. Kagama (1886), which upheld the validity of a federal statute imposing certain federal criminal laws on reservation Indians:

[T]hey are spoken of as 'wards of the nation,' 'pupils,' as local dependent communities. In this spirit the United States has conducted its relations to them from its organization to this time. . . .

. . . These Indian tribes are wards of the nation. They are communities dependent on the United States. . . . From their very weakness and helplessness, so largely due to the course of dealing of the Federal Government with them, and the treaties in which it has been promised, there arises the duty of protection, and with it the power.

The power of the General Government over these remnants of a race once powerful, now weak and diminished in numbers, is necessary to their protection, as well as to the safety of those among whom they dwell.

The Court's focus on the dependence of the tribes on the federal government and the duty and power arising from that dependence left the federal government with virtually unlimited power both to decide what course was best for the Indians and to act upon that decision without regard for the wishes of the Indians themselves. Under the guise of "protecting" the Indians, the government launched a full-scale assault on the most fundamental right of the Indian tribes--the right to maintain distinct political and cultural communities.

This assault took the form of the allotment policy, by which tribal lands were parceled out to adult members and "surplus" lands were opened to non-Indian settlement. The underlying philosophy of the allotment policy was that the tribal lifestyle bred sloth and dependence upon the generosity of others, while American free enterprise bred initiative and independence. Only through the pride of individual ownership of land might Indians be introduced to the benefits of American society and, ultimately, become full-fledged, church-going, tax-paying American citizens.

The tribes resisted allotment but the United States was not about to be deterred by their protests. The government staged "negotiations" with the tribes, but the agreements that resulted were tainted by duress, coercion, forgery and fraud. The courts engaged in a charade. Although American constitutional law accorded almost sacred importance to vested property rights, Indian property rights, established by treaty, received no protection. In Lone Wolf v.

Hitchcock (1903), Kiowa chief Lone Wolf challenged the validity of the "agreement" by which Kiowa, Comanche and Kiowa Apache lands were allotted and sold to whites. Despite clear evidence of fraud and the breach of the 1867 treaty with the tribes, the Court would grant no relief:

The power exists to abrogate the provisions of an Indian treaty, though presumably such power will be exercised only when circumstances arise which will not only justify the government in disregarding the stipulations of the treaty, but may demand, in the interest of the country and the Indians themselves, that it should do so. . . .

In view of the legislative power possessed by Congress over treaties with the Indians, and Indian tribal property, we may not specially consider [the allegations of fraud], since all these matters, in any event, were solely within the domain of the legislative authority and its action is conclusive upon the courts.

Theoretically, then, congressional power could be exercised only for the good of the Indians. But the Court would not second-guess Congress as to what was or was not good for the Indians. Thus, congressional power was unlimited under the Lone Wolf doctrine.

The racist basis of this vast congressional authority finds expression in a remarkable passage in the case of United States v. Sandoval (1913). In Sandoval, the issue was whether Pueblo Indians--whose sedentary, agrarian lifestyles distinguished them from the hunting nomads of the plains states--were "Indians" subject to vast congressional power. The Court found that they were:

Always living in separate and isolated communities, adhering to primitive modes of life, largely influenced by superstition and fetishism, and chiefly governed according to crude customs inherited from their ancestors, [Pueblo Indians]

are essentially a simple, uninformed and inferior people. . . .

. . . As a superior and civilized nation [the United States has both] the power and the duty of exercising a fostering care and protection over all dependent Indian communities within its borders. . . .

The Pueblo people had survived hundreds of years of Spanish rule, carved gardens from the desert and created a theology so complex as to baffle anthropologists, yet were branded as "simple" and "superstitious" and, therefore, subject to Congress' plenary power.

The assault on Indian tribalism was not limited to dissembling tribal patterns of land ownership. Tribal governmental institutions were ignored by federal agents and entities based upon American modes of government were established to discredit traditional tribal leaders. Far worse was the direct suppression of tribal religious practices. Christian missionaries were imported into tribal communities and subsidized by the federal government. Tribal religious ceremonies and dances actually were outlawed by zealous federal agents firmly convinced of the propriety of their efforts to Christianize the Indians.

Far from bringing Indians to the prosperity enjoyed by white Americans, the assimilationist policies devastated the Indians, both collectively and individually. Ninety million acres, two-thirds of the tribal land base, was lost to sales of "surplus" lands, land thieves and tax sales. A cycle of abject poverty was begun which only now shows signs of breaking. Sickness and ignorance were endemic. Far from showing Indians the benefits of American civilization, the

assimilationist policies nurtured a firm resolve in the Indians to cling to tribal structures.

This era was the darkest hour of Indian civil rights history. Despite constitutional guarantees, Indians' rights of free speech, free exercise of religion and property were disregarded. More significantly still, the right of Indian tribes to maintain a distinct political and cultural existence was violated intentionally and systematically. The damage to Indian well-being has yet to be repaired.

REFORM -- TRIBAL REORGANIZATION

A new era, an era of reform, began in 1924 when Indians were made citizens of the United States. Many Indians already had become citizens in the early 1900s through "competency commissions" established to determine whether particular Indians had adjusted to the majority culture sufficiently to be released from government guardianship. One might expect the Indians to have been anxious to be declared "competent." In fact, however, the declaration of competency was resisted by many, perhaps most, Indians. Competency meant the end of federal protection of Indian-owned allotments. Many thousands of Indians saw their land removed from trust or restricted status, rendering the land alienable and taxable. Such lands soon were lost--taken by fraud or state tax sales.

Unlike the grant of citizenship through competency commissions, the 1924 Indian citizenship act, fortunately, did not terminate the

federal duty of protecting Indians and their property. Indians thus were the beneficiaries of a unique status. They enjoyed not only the rights and privileges of American citizenship, but also the rights and privileges of membership in distinct tribal political communities. The operative assumption of federal policy makers in 1924 was that the tribes eventually would disappear and Indians would be citizens only of federal and state governments. When that assumption proved false and the tribes refused to disappear, what resulted was the special dual citizenship enjoyed by Indians today.

In the 1920s, however, tribal citizenship generally meant that one was poor, ignorant and sick. Despite all of the promises made when Indian lands were allotted, the United States failed to provide the support services necessary for Indians to make the radical transition from tribal communal lifestyles to the individualism of the majority culture. The Indians rejected the individualistic philosophy of the Americans and continued to practice and abide by tribal customs and mores. Not surprisingly, they were swallowed up by their more competitive, more greedy neighbors. By 1928 it was apparent that the allotment policy had failed miserably. A study of Indian policy was commissioned, and the resulting report, the Meriam Report, revealed to the world the pitiful condition of the Indians. The American Indian Policy Review Commission in 1977 summarized the findings as follows:

The income of the typical Indian family was low. . . . Only 2 percent of the Indians had incomes over \$500 a year. Partly as a result of this poverty the health of the Indians in comparison with the rest of the population was bad. The death rate and infant mortality were high. Tuberculosis and trachoma were extremely prevalent. Living and housing

conditions were appalling; diet was poor; sanitary provisions were generally lacking. The system of public health administration and relief work was inadequate. The educational system had no well-considered broad educational policy. A uniform curriculum was being applied throughout the Indian school system, although the different tribes were at quite different stages of development. Indian children were being fed at reservation schools on an average expenditure of 11 cents a day per child, and were being forced to do heavy domestic work actually to ease the financial burden but ostensibly to acquire training in useful industrial arts.

A new wave of humanitarian sympathy for the Indians swept the liberal community. Many felt partly responsible for these conditions since the humanitarian organizations had backed the allotment policy.

The policy that emerged from the social activism of the 1930s was based on the proposition that there was a place for Indian tribes in modern America. Under the leadership of Commissioner of Indian Affairs John Collier, a policy of restoring tribal governments to their rightful place was adopted. The Indian Reorganization Act of 1934 allowed tribes to enact constitutions for their tribal governments and renounced the allotment policy. Tribal governmental structures were recognized as the appropriate means for effecting federal policies towards Indians. The right of Indian people to maintain distinct political communities was recognized by Congress for the first time in over a half a century. The assumption that tribes would disappear no longer was the basis for federal Indian policy.

Ironically, the enthusiasm with which the federal officials pursued the new policy led to serious intrusions into the Indians'

right to choose. Indeed, Collier himself led the charge for ratification of IRA constitutions that more often than not reflected some bureaucrat's notion of how traditional tribal structures might be converted to modern constitutional bodies. Many tribes had IRA constitutions foisted upon them against the wishes of a clear majority of tribal members. Most Indians remained suspicious and reluctant to be involved in any government scheme to help them.

Nevertheless, reform proceeded full apace. Tribal governments were reorganized and began to reassert their authority over Indian reservations. Health and education services were improved, and Indians began to recover from the injury caused by the allotment policy. The reform movement, however, was short-lived.

ASSIMILATION -- THE TERMINATION POLICY

With the end of the depression and the beginning of World War II, America turned to other priorities. The federal Indian budget was slashed and Collier's policy came under sharp attack from congressional critics whose constituents were unhappy with the renewal of tribal authority. Much of this unhappiness was rooted in simple racism, but some was based on the fact that non-Indian businessmen no longer had free reign to plunder reservation resources. The amount of money necessary for the administration of Indian affairs was another source of congressional displeasure. Also significant was a bizarre ideological attack born of the anti-communist hysteria of the day. Indian tribalism came to be viewed as distinctly un-American and, indeed, communistic. The stage thus was set for yet another assault on Indian tribalism.

The rallying cry for the new assault on tribalism was a familiar one. Indians, it was said, needed to be brought into the mainstream of American life, entitled to the same rights and privileges and subject to the same laws. As always, the policy was deemed to be in the best interests of the Indians, notwithstanding the almost universal opposition of the Indians themselves.

The policy was called "termination." It involved the dismantling of tribal government, the distribution of tribal assets to tribal members and the end of federal services to individual Indians. Sponsors of the legislation spoke euphemistically of "emancipating" the Indians from federal domination. Why emancipation from federal control should require the destruction of tribal government is a question left unanswered.

The assimilationist policy took other forms as well. A program of voluntary relocation of Indians from reservations to urban areas was begun. Indian families were provided with funds for moving expenses to cities, placed in poor housing, provided with menial jobs and then abandoned. The result was the creation of dreadfully poor urban Indian communities in such places as Chicago, Los Angeles, and New York City.

Tribal authority and federal responsibilities were weakened further by Public Law 280, a statute that transferred criminal and civil jurisdiction over Indian country from the federal government to certain states. Other states were given the option of assuming

jurisdiction over reservation areas at their convenience.

Responsibility for the health and education of Indians slowly was being transferred to the states through other legislation. The federal government was trying to get out of the business of dealing with Indian tribes.

Ironically, even as this assault on the Indian right of self-government was under way, the rights of Indians as American citizens were being established firmly in the courts. Despite the 1924 grant of citizenship to Indians, many states continued to discriminate against Indians for purposes of voting, jury duty and providing testimony in court. This discrimination fell to the commands of the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Amendments. Even as the NAACP carefully litigated test cases leading to the abandonment of the "separate but equal" doctrine, activist lawyers were chipping away at state laws that discriminated against Indians on the basis of their race.

As was true of American blacks, however, the rights of Indians that existed on paper often were denied in practice. Racism towards Indians in the communities in which they lived was as prevalent and overt as racism towards blacks in the south. Racial epithets and petty discrimination in service establishments were a part of Indian life for the first half of the twentieth century. Indians, therefore, were to become the direct beneficiaries of the civil rights revolution of the 1960s.

INDIANS AND THE CIVIL RIGHTS MOVEMENT

By 1960, the termination policy was discredited. Those Indian tribes that were terminated fell quickly into ruin, and their members became burdens on state welfare rolls. The resources of terminated tribes were plundered by non-Indian business interests. Even the advocates of the policy had begun to question its wisdom.

As the civil rights movement gained strength, Indian-interest organizations became active participants. Indian demands were the same as those of other minorities in terms of the rights of citizenship. In another respect, however, they were fundamentally different. Indians asserted not only their constitutional rights as members of the American body politic, but also their right to maintain distinct political and cultural communities. In short, Indians were asserting a right to be different.

They met with success on both fronts. This success is reflected in both the legislation and the judicial decisions of the sixties and early seventies. Indians routinely were made beneficiaries of civil rights legislation such as the Voting Rights Act, the Fair Housing Act and the Equal Employment Opportunity Act. The Voting Rights Act, for example, not only prohibits discrimination against Indians, but also creates special protections for them as persons whose primary language is not English.

Reflecting the fact that Indian rights go beyond those afforded to other citizens, however, special provisions were included in civil

rights legislation. The Equal Employment Opportunity Act, for instance, excludes from its prohibition on discrimination programs granting employment preferences to Indians by employers on or near Indian reservations. On its face, this seems ripe for an attack on the grounds of "reverse discrimination." In Morton v. Mancari (1974), however, the Supreme Court upheld a statute granting preference to Indians for employment in the Bureau of Indian Affairs and the Indian Health Service. The Court reasoned that the preference was not one based on race but, rather, one based on the unique political relationship between Indian nations and the United States. As a preference based on political status rather than race, it only needed to be "tied rationally" to the fulfillment of federal obligations to the Indians to be upheld as constitutional. It was not subject to the "strict scrutiny" applied to racial classifications under the Fifth Amendment.

The status of tribes as distinct political communities was recognized as well in much of the social legislation spawned by the civil rights movement. "New Frontier" and "Great Society" programs such as the Office of Economic Opportunity's Headstart and Community Action programs, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, and the Comprehensive Older Americans Act all expressly included Indian tribes as governments eligible for participation.

The influence of these heady days of the civil rights movement on Indian tribes and people can hardly be overstated. Aside from placing the weight of the law on the tribes' side and providing economic

resources to Indian communities, perhaps the most important aspect was a renewal of Indian confidence and pride. Termination had bred a certain timidity. If a tribe had even modest economic success, it became a candidate for termination. Termination could be avoided, on the other hand, by being poor and docile. The civil rights movement changed all of this. Indians came to learn that they could assert their rights successfully without fear of termination.

An interesting aspect of the combined civil rights movement and the rejuvenation of tribal self-government was the passage of the Indian Civil Rights Act of 1968. Because of their unique political status and the absence of any express limitations on their powers in the Constitution, Indian tribes were not subject to the restrictions on governmental action to which federal and state governments were subject. As tribal governments began to exercise their long-dormant powers, concern was raised that Indians were unprotected from arbitrary and harmful actions of tribal officials. Congress decided to look into the state of Indian civil rights.

Tribal leaders were not thrilled at the prospect of having their actions reviewed by federal tribunals. Many opposed the legislation on the grounds that it represented an attempt to impose non-Indian values on tribal societies. Others believed that the Act would result in costly lawsuits against the tribes by antagonistic non-Indians and dissident tribal members with no genuine complaint. Such fears were well-founded, but Congress deemed unacceptable the existence of governmental bodies lacking legal restraints on the exercise of official power.

The result was the Indian Civil Rights Act. The Act, in essence, requires tribal governments to afford to persons under its jurisdiction the civil rights guaranteed by the Constitution. Tribal concerns, however, were accommodated in several respects. The freedom of religion provision included the right of free exercise of religion but not the prohibition on the establishment of a state religion. A number of tribal governments are theocratic, and Congress protected these governments in the Act. Another difference between the Act and the Bill of Rights involves the right to counsel in criminal proceedings. By 1968, the Supreme Court required states and the federal government to pay for attorneys for indigent criminal defendants. Tribal budgets could not bear such an expense. Congress, therefore, provided that criminal defendants in tribal courts were entitled to counsel, but only at their own expense.

Another difference between the Act and the Constitution was a limitation on the punishments tribal courts could impose on persons convicted of crimes. The Act limits criminal sentences in tribal courts to six months of imprisonment and \$500 fines. The reasoning behind this limitation was that, under the Major Crimes Act of 1883, the federal government was responsible for prosecuting most felonies involving Indian offenders. The problem with this reasoning is that federal investigators and prosecutors often are less than diligent in responding to reservation crime. If federal officials fail to act, tribal officials are left to address serious crimes with minimal sentences.

Another of the tribes' objections was not addressed specifically--the fear of large numbers of federal lawsuits against tribal officials. The Act was vague on the question of whether such suits were proper, and for ten years the federal courts regularly entertained such suits. In 1978, however, the Supreme Court ruled in Santa Clara Pueblo v. Martinez that the Act did not authorize federal court suits except suits involving persons held in tribal custody. With the single exception, therefore, of petitions for writs of habeas corpus, persons aggrieved by official tribal action affecting rights guaranteed by the Act must make their claims in tribal forums.

Although tribal opposition to the Act was widespread, it was not universal. Many provisions of the Act clearly were in the tribes' interests and encountered no opposition. States were prohibited prospectively from exerting jurisdiction under Public Law 280 without the consent of the affected tribes, and retrocession of state jurisdiction already existing under Public Law 280 was authorized. Other provisions were directed at providing financial and technical support to tribal courts. Finally, the Act required the Secretary of the Interior to revise certain materials relating to federal Indian law, including a revision of Felix Cohen's classic treatise Federal Indian Law. The inclusion of these provisions softened tribal opposition to the Act and, indeed, led some tribes to support the bill.

Even as the general civil rights struggle was winding down, Indians were gearing up for an initiative that would take them beyond

even the dramatic gains of the sixties. Their rights as American citizens were firmly established, in law if not always in fact. The time now had come to assert their rights as tribal citizens, rights born of the tribes' status as domestic nations and confirmed by hundreds of treaties. Treaty rights and the right of tribal self-government would become the new focus of Indian efforts.

Perhaps the primary battleground in the field of treaty rights was a remote site on the Nisqually River in Washington known as Frank's Landing. In the 1850s, the Treaty of Point Elliott was signed by Indian nations in Washington Territory and approved by Congress. Among the treaty's provisions was a guarantee that Indians would retain the right of "taking fish at usual and accustomed grounds . . . in common with all citizens of the territory." The Indians exercised this right for 100 years before non-Indians began to challenge their fishing activities. Despite a 1963 federal court decision sustaining the Indians' rights, state courts enjoined Indian net fishing. A series of protests followed in which Indian fishermen were arrested and jailed by state officials. Allegations of police brutality fell on deaf ears. Despite continuing success in federal court, the treaty fishermen were harrassed, threatened and, in one case at least, shot by local non-Indian residents.

The Indians persisted until a dramatic court decision held that they were entitled to nearly fifty percent of the annual harvest. The non-Indian citizenry was enraged, but the decision survived review after review until, in 1979, the Supreme Court itself affirmed the

decision in all key respects. In so holding, the Court remarked that the lower court's decision had been the subject of the most concerted disregard of federal court rulings by state officials since the desegregation rulings of the fifties and sixties. Against all odds, the Indians prevailed in protecting rights recognized over a century earlier, and established that treaty rights do not fade with time. The allocation of resources made in the treaties were ruled binding on the descendants of the treating parties, notwithstanding the different circumstances that now exist in Indian country and surrounding communities.

Rights over a century old were being redeemed in the eastern United States as well. Attorneys for several eastern tribes, including tribes that long had been neglected by federal authorities, discovered a startling fact. Many treaties and other documents taking land from the eastern tribes never were ratified by Congress as was required by the Trade and Intercourse Acts of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. Under the plain language of the acts, such transactions were void and of no effect. These cases presented a critical test of America's commitment to the rule of law. Although some claims were nearly 200 years old, ancient rules of law established for the benefit of Indian tribes, if followed, would result in court victories for the tribes. Despite intense political pressure from the affected states and their residents, the lower federal courts ruled favorably on the Indian claims in case after case. Although many of the claims were settled by the parties and the settlements approved by Congress, others remained in court until, in

1984, the Supreme Court agreed to hear a case involving title to 100,000 acres in New York state. Finally, in County of Oneida v. Oneida Indian Nation (1985), the Supreme Court upheld the Indian claims. Wrongs committed almost two centuries ago, thus, still could be addressed by the courts and lost rights restored.

Tribal rights of self-government also were redeemed in the Indians' legal offensive. State power over reservation Indians was curtailed in the areas of taxation, civil court jurisdiction and Indian child welfare proceedings. Tribal authority over non-Indians in Indian country, though denied in criminal proceedings, was affirmed in other areas. Despite significant defeats in court, the legal offensive generally was quite effective and the governmental authority of Indian tribes, which had been dormant for so long, was asserted broadly and effectively.

Tribal rights of self-government were redeemed in the legislative arena as well. The termination policy was renounced formally through the restoration of the Menominee Tribe of Wisconsin in 1973 and several other tribes thereafter. The Indian Self-Determination Act of 1975 gave tribes the ability to administer federal assistance programs and wrest control of such programs from the government officials that had dominated reservation affairs for a century. The Indian Child Welfare Act of 1978 placed the welfare of Indian children squarely within tribal forums and limited state power in this critical area, state power that too often had resulted in Indian children being removed and isolated from their tribal communities. The American

Indian Religious Freedom Act of 1979 recognized the validity of traditional Indian religious practices and pledged to honor and accommodate such practices.

All of these developments in the seventies and eighties resulted from the civil rights movement of the sixties. Indians built on the progress made in the sixties in registering these important legal victories in the seventies. In a very real sense, therefore, it was the civil rights movement that made these victories possible.

Still, the rights claimed by the Indians were different from those claimed by other minorities. The civil rights movement was responsible for the vindication of the rights of Indians as individuals. The vindication of tribal rights, however, could be accomplished only by the Indians themselves. Thus, while the tribal rights movement of the 1970s grew out of the general struggle for civil rights of the previous decade, the tribal rights movement was distinctively Indian because the rights claimed were distinctively Indian rights--rights held by no other people in the country.

No discussion of the Indian rights movement is complete without some mention of the militant wing of the movement. Although the American Indian Movement probably never had the influence in the Indian community that the American media believed it had, it did reflect accurately the frustration and anger that all Indians felt to at least some degree. The seizure of Alcatraz Island in 1969, the takeover of BIA headquarters in 1972 and the siege at Wounded Knee,

South Dakota in 1973 all served to focus public attention on the injustice of Indian life. Like all militant movements, AIM was born of the belief among young poor people that the system that dominated them was incapable of reform from within.

Measuring the impact of AIM is difficult. Its ability to focus attention on Indian conditions was beneficial to some degree. The claims and demands of AIM, however, did not always reflect the position of legitimate tribal authorities. AIM activities frequently heightened tensions between Indians and whites and, indeed, among the Indians themselves. AIM's presence in certain communities, particularly the Pine Ridge Reservation in South Dakota, resulted in brutal crackdowns by federal authorities that involved systematic violations of the civil liberties of persons not affiliated with AIM. Such crackdowns, of course, were not the fault of AIM, but to the extent that such crackdowns were predictable, AIM did a disservice by choosing to agitate in particular communities.

All in all, the militant Indian movement probably was helpful, if for no other reason than that it demonstrated the commitment of Indian people to the redemption of their rights and the extremes that were possible if legitimate Indian demands were not honored. Like the other militant organizations of the time, the visibility and influence of AIM had diminished, in no small part due to official harassment and campaigns to discredit AIM. Several AIM members remain in jail despite dubious evidence of guilt and clear police misconduct. The apex of the movement has passed.

The gains made in the sixties and seventies have given rise to an ominous tide of support for organizations dedicated to dismantling tribal treaty and governmental rights. This backlash has its roots in the philosophy of those who preach the idea of "reverse discrimination." This philosophy seems to hold that the current generation of white Americans is not responsible for past violations of minority rights and should not be made to suffer in efforts to redress past injustices. Whatever merit this idea may have in other contexts, it is intellectually bankrupt in its application to Indian treaty rights.

As was true years ago in the Northwest, hunting and fishing rights in the Great Lakes region is the hottest treaty issue today. Almost as if to demonstrate that the frontier mentality is alive and well, Indian hunting and fishing rights seem to inspire the most strident, vocal and occasionally, violent opposition to the enforcement of treaty rights. Bumper stickers bearing the legend "Save a Deer, Shoot an Indian" are appearing in the Great Lakes region in response to a federal court decree affirming the Indians' right to hunt and fish free from state regulation. Apparently unmindful of the experience of state officials in the Northwest, officials of the Great Lakes states are engaged in a series of legal maneuvers designed to avoid the command of the federal court.

Anti-Indian activists in the Northwest, interestingly, have become more sophisticated in their methods. Last year, a state referendum in Washington urged the abrogation of Indian treaty rights. Senators and representatives from Northwest states introduced treaty

abrogation legislation in reponse to the referendum. Although we have every reason to believe that the legislation will fail, the effort demonstrates the unwillingness of its supporters to abide by the laws their ancestors made. And there lies the hollowness of their claim.

Indian treaty rights were not created by any act of generosity. They represent, instead, the quid pro quo for cessions of vast amounts of tribal land. The settlers who entered these lands did so on the basis of those treaties. The Indians have made no demand that those lands be returned or that the rights of non-Indians under the treaties be abrogated. Why they should be expected to give up their rights under the treaties is most difficult to understand.

In the end, the backlash movement is troublesome and worrisome, but has not scored any major successes, at least in Congress. Perhaps in a few years, when exercises of Indian rights are not so novel and unanticipated, the backlash movement will fade away. Even in the current conservative political climate, Indians continue to score major legislative and judicial victories. The results are more mixed, perhaps, than ten or fifteen years ago, but there seems to be no inherent conflict between non-racist conservatism and Indian rights. Indeed, the most significant Indian policy initiative of the last twenty-five years occurred during the Nixon administration.

One can say quite accurately that Indians are better off today than at any time in the past century. Even so, much remains to be done. In its 1979 report on America's compliance with the human

rights accords, the United States said that:

Native Americans, on the average, have the lowest per capita income, the highest unemployment rate, the lowest level of educational attainment, the shortest lives, the worst health and housing conditions and the highest suicide rate in the United States. The poverty among Indian families is nearly three times greater than the rate for non-Indian families and Native people collectively rank at the bottom of every social and economic statistical indicator.

This is the legacy of past failures to honor the rights of Indian people, both as human beings and as members of distinct tribal political communities. As Felix Cohen wrote, America's treatment of Indians, even more than its treatment of other minorities, reflects the rise and fall of its democratic faith. The central issue remains the same. Whether future generations will honor the special rights of Indians acknowledged by past generations remains an open question.

References

- Cherokee Nation v. Georgia 30 U.S. (5 Pet.) 1 (1831)
- Worcester v. Georgia 31 U.S. (6 Pet.) 515 (1832)
- Johnson v. McIntosh 21 U.S. (8 Wheat) 543 (1823)
- Elk v. Wilkins 112 U.S. 94 (1884)
- United States v. Kagama 118 U.S. 375 (1886)
- Lone Wolf v. Mitchcock 187 U.S. 553 (1903)
- United States v. Sandoval 231 U.S. 28 (1913)
- Morton v. Mancari 417 U.S. 535 (1974)
- Santa Clara Pueblo v. Martinez 436 U.S. 49 (1978)
- County of Oneida v. Oneida Indian Nation (Sup. Ct. 1985)
- American Indian Policy Review Commission: Final Report 2 vols.
Washington, D.C., 1977.
- Felix S. Cohen Handbook of Federal Indian Law. 1982 edition.
Charlottesville, Va.

714-23-08

Indians in the American Revolution:
Concord Bridge and the "Savage" Indians

by

Bernard W. Sheehan

Indiana University

In assessing the importance of the Indians for the Revolution a historian has contended recently not only that the threat posed by the native warriors contributed to imperial indebtedness thus impelling Parliament to levy the taxes that provoked American revolt but that once the conflict had begun the concentration of Indian power on the British side delayed the American achievement of independence.¹

The first of these intriguing assertions rests on a counterfactual model that is in itself historiographically suspect, for it assumes that without the presence of the native tribes there would have been no imperial wars or that conversely the Indians were the major factor in those wars thus insuring that the British government would incur vast expenses that could be covered only by taxing the colonies. In fact such imaginings offend against the uniqueness of human history. By extracting one of the elements in an historical puzzle, one creates not an alternative history but a story of fiction that can be made to come out as one pleases. The story may be plausible, but it is not history. In the actual congruence of events the Indians no doubt played a significant role in the imperial wars and for that reason can be supposed to have been a factor in the depletion of the British treasury. But by how much? In the tangle of

British finances in the Seven Years War, it seems far more plausible to isolate the subsidy afforded by the Pitt ministry to sustain Frederick's maneuvers on the continent² than to stress the cost of fighting French and Indians in America. It was, after all, an international conflict of which America was no more than a minor area. But why push the issue? History is too complex a skein to allow for the isolation of one of its threads. The Indians were plainly a significant factor in the imperial conflict in America but whether it will serve any purpose to draw from this fact some immediate or crucial connective to the American Revolution strikes me as a fruitless endeavor.

The second contention opens a more fertile field of inquiry, though I doubt that the evidence will support the argument so baldly stated. No doubt the native warriors, at least north of the Ohio, fought vigorously for Britain and by all accounts with a great deal of success. After 1777, the Iroquois in particular kept the northern frontier settlements at risk and for a time stemmed the movement of people into the West. But did all this activity affect appreciably the outcome of the war? Certainly the makers of the peace did not think so. The Iroquois and their western allies found themselves at the conclusion of the conflict abandoned in their victories precisely because their achievements did not count in the European "correlation of forces." Assuredly both sides found their native allies useful, but not of sufficient importance to warrant taking their interests into consideration. Washington perceived the reality very early. He knew that the war would be won in the East and as a consequence, despite much pressure, he largely ignored the conflict in the West.

He delayed an attack on the Iroquois until 1779 in large measure because he knew that such an effort held little significance for the outcome of the Revolution. The war was won at Saratoga, Cowpens, and Yorktown and what occurred at Cherry Valley, Newtown, or Bryan's Station, though it involved profound human drama, lacked the strategic weight to affect the diplomatic equation. Indeed this was the tragedy of the natives' situation. They could not help but lose even for winning.

But perhaps the native people could win in another way, by means of more subtle effects on the white man's world. Without the influence of the Indian, the argument goes, the colonists would probably not have been prepared for Revolution in the first place. "Without the steady impress of Indian culture, they would not have been or felt sufficiently 'Americanized' to stand before the world as an independent nation."³ The contention contains a grain of truth. The American sense of self has long been formed with attention to the image of the Indian. But, of course, the question here is the relationship of the image to the reality. Was the native American in any accurate anthropological sense the Indian of the image? Was the native way of life really free of the burdens of social order, in effect a cultureless world suitable for habitation by a version of Kant's noumenal self?⁴ Or was this special sort of Indian a figment of the white man's imagination that served many purposes, the most important of which was to separate the Americans from Europe and drive them toward Revolution. My own suspicion is that the real native American has little if any similarity to this Indian of the imagination who served so well the psychic needs and propaganda

purposes of the new nation. Whatever effect the real native people may have had on the culture of the new nation, it paled before the significance of the white man's self-constructed image of the Indian.

One version of the image allowed the Indian to represent the patriot cause in its defense of liberty against the supposed oppressions of the old world. In this sense the Americans, as Charles de Gaulle once observed, lived "under the illusion that George Washington was an Indian chief who drove out the British landlords."⁵ The idea, no doubt, had deep roots in American thinking and feeling. Especially in the flush of revolutionary enthusiasm many Americans seemed inclined to think that it reflected the reality about themselves and their movement. Even Washington on occasion behaved as though he saw himself in this light. But when the Indians in great numbers joined the other side the image faded.

In fact during the revolutionary years the negative image of the Indians predominated in American thinking. On both sides of the conflict the Indians represented the antithesis to civility and to the Americans the violation of nature itself. Whatever justification may be found for thinking that the real Indian conformed to the positive image, it would be difficult to argue that the negative conception was more than a distant reflection of the reality. But, of course, the point is that neither concerned reality so much as the American and British imaginations locked in an implacable contest of propaganda. The fate of the native reputation during the Revolution became evident in the first hours of the war: at Concord Bridge.

After the exchange of fire at the North Bridge in Concord on April 19, 1775, three British light infantrymen lay in the road east of the bridge, two wounded, the other dead. The Americans, having delivered their volleys and driven the British force toward the center of the town, crossed the bridge and took up positions on high ground closer to their British enemies. A young man, perhaps aged twenty-one, an axe in hand, crossed the deserted bridge and came upon one of the wounded soldiers who tried to drag himself out of the road. They exchanged gestures, possibly words, and the American raised the axe and struck the soldier in the head. He lived for another hour or two, but in the meantime presented a bloody spectacle for anyone who might pass the site of the skirmish. Shortly after this occurrence the first contingents of troops led by Captain Lawrence Parsons, dispatched earlier to the Barrett farm to search for military supplies, crossed the bridge in the direction of the town to join the main British forces. The sight of the mutilated soldier caught their attention, and they concluded from his wounds that the Americans had fallen to scalping British casualties. Soon the rumor spread through the British regiments. The Americans, true to the image of the new continent, had taken up the ways of "savage" Indians.⁶

Trivial in itself, the incident and the reaction to it on both sides contained profound implications for the meaning attached to the conflict by the participants. Accusations that atrocities had occurred were hardly significant. All wars throw up a quota of such allegations. Nor was it notable that the description should be inaccurate or exaggerated, though their appearance so early in the war, no doubt, revealed the depth of animosity that had developed in

the previous decade of controversy. The significant datum, however, can be found in the substance of the accusation. Although no native warriors had taken part in the fighting at Lexington and Concord or on the road to Boston, the Indian became an issue, as he would throughout the Revolution, in the first clash of the American struggle to preserve liberty and establish independence.

The news carried by the common soldiers quickly reached the ears of their officers. Lieutenant Colonel Francis Smith, who commanded the expedition to Concord, reported in a masterpiece of vaguery, for he had no direct knowledge, that "it appears that, after the bridge was quitted, they scalped and otherwise ill-treated one or two of the men who were either killed or severely wounded..." Lord Percy, who joined the expedition only after the alleged incident, took the occasion in his report to Gage to commend the "usual intrepidity & spirit" of his men and to note their exasperation "at the cruelty and barbarity of the Rebels, who scalped & cut off the ears of some of the wounded men who fell into their hands." From these accounts, and no doubt from other information, Gage offered a somewhat more circumstantial description. Three soldiers, he wrote, were observed on the ground, "one of them scalped, his head much mangled, and his ears cut off, though not quite dead--a sight which struck the soldiers with horror." Indeed, on the basis of additional direct intelligence, assuming that Gage had it in his possession when he wrote his report, the general might have been less definite in accusing the colonists of scalping his men. No less than five of the light infantrymen who crossed the bridge with Captain Parsons and witnessed the scene swore that "they saw a Man belonging to the Light Company of the 4th

Regiment with the Skin over His Eye's Cut and also the Top part of His Ears cut off--."7 Not quite a scalping, but much like what seems actually to have happened. Moreover, this account reduced the victims to one. Despite this sworn testimony from eyewitnesses, Gage never changed his story, perhaps because he thought the soldiers' deposition consistent with a scalping already established by other more reliable evidence or because the original account was too good to relinquish. Besides, whatever the troops had said under oath differed markedly from the convictions of the men who survived the expedition. For them, British soldiers had once again suffered the "savage" penalty that had overtaken so many of their fellows in the imperial wars.

In the wake of the event, news spread quickly of the apparent American resort to the methods of what was commonly called "savage" warfare. Lieutenant Colonel James Abercrombie, who fell later at Bunker Hill, told Cadwallader Colden of the scalping, adding that the hapless soldier while still alive had not only lost his ears but also his nose. A young ensign, Jeremy Lister, who accompanied the British force to Concord, recounted the same story but commented more broadly that "such barbarity exercis'd upon the Corps could scarcely be paralleld [sic] by the most uncivilised Savages." Within two weeks the mutilation, described by an officer to his friends in New York, had become even more elaborate; this time the victim lost his ears and his eyes. The Americans were so barbarous, wrote the officer, "that nothing but savages could have equalled" their behavior. He ended redundantly with the assertion that such "unheard-of barbarity could never be performed before by any civilized Nation."⁸

For English pamphleteers, engaged in a decade-old dispute with the American counterparts, the incident confirmed their view of the American cause. John Lind proved extraordinarily agile in defending the right of the crown to employ Indian (or German, or Kalmuck, or Russian) auxiliaries while at the same time he condemned the Americans for what he perceived as Indian-like behavior. Besides, he argued, the Americans had used Indians first. At Tybee Island in Georgia they had not only dressed as Indians but had taken scalps. For acts of "death and desolation," the Americans have set the example. But worst of all "their humanity is written in indelible characters with the blood of the soldiers scalped and gouged at Lexington." Lind had the town wrong, but he managed to give the eye gouging story an imaginative twist. In his interpretation, gouging ("a way of tearing the eyes out of the sockets") became a practice peculiar to the Americans of which "their adroitness in inflicting [it], more than one of the British soldiers at Lexington, are melancholy proofs." John Moir took up Lind's sensational version and quoted from it at length. The "savage Provincials" scalped two soldiers while they were still breathing. "They appeared, by the traces of blood, to have rolled in the agonies of this horrid species of death, several yards from the place where they had been scalped." And the gouging was inflicted on yet another man, also before he died.⁹

The message in these tales could scarcely be mistaken. The American cause was tainted by the American method of defending it. "The rebels fought like the savages of the country." They acted "with the most unmanly barbarity." Peter Oliver, in his bitterness at the American betrayal of British loyalties, carried the argument a step

further. He wrote that two of the troops "at fewest" had been scalped, one while still alive. By 1781, when Oliver dated his manuscript, the British were on the defensive for their alliance with the native tribes, hence Oliver could not but be pleased to find the Americans more "savage" than the Indians themselves. "Let Patriots roar as loud as they please, about the Barbarity of an Indian scalping Knife," he wrote, "but let them know, that an Indian Savage strikes the deadly Blow before he takes off the Scalp. It was reserved for the New England Savage, only, to take it off while his Brother was alive." Oliver's lesson in the ethnology of native scalp-taking might have fallen short of the mark, but he clearly drove home his point that the American cause could not be easily distinguished from the mode of war typical of American "savages," and justly execrated by all civilized men.¹⁰

The Americans recognized the seriousness of the charge. They were themselves to make free use of accusations of British "barbarism," and they were acutely sensitive to the presence of the Indian on the continent. They had long believed, after all, that the native and his ways posed an immediate threat to the integrity of civil life in America. Any attempt to identify the Americans and their cause with behavior attributed to the Indians demanded an immediate response. Thus the Massachusetts Provincial Congress took up the issue. In order to assure that the people of Massachusetts should not be dishonored by appearing to be "savage and barbarous," the Congress published a deposition signed by the two townsmen who had buried the British soldiers killed at the bridge. Neither of the bodies, according to Zachariah Brown and Thomas Davis, Jr., had been

scalped or relieved of its ears.¹¹ Within days of the events, the Reverend William Gordon of Roxbury reached Lexington and Concord seeking an accurate account of the battles. He was a patriot with a bent for oral history and a healthy respect for the effects of propaganda on the American cause. By mid-May he had completed a short description of the conflict of April 19 (a later version was to follow in his History) that gave the townspeople's understanding of what had occurred. As Gordon received the story from his fellow clergyman William Emerson, who lived within sight of the bridge, "a young fellow coming over the bridge in order to join the country people, and seeing the soldier wounded and attempting to get up, not being under the feelings of humanity, very barbarously broke his skull, and let out his brains with a small axe, (apprehend of a tomahawk kind,) but as to his being scalped and having his ears cut off, there was nothing to it." Gordon's report had the ring of truth, though his language may have revealed more than he intended. The boy had acted without humanity, "barbarously," and he had used an instrument of the "tomahawk kind." Gordon refuted the charge of scalping, but his language, if not his intention, had equated the young man's brutal act with the absence of civility and the white man's evaluation of native manners.¹²

In further defense of their position Americans claimed that General Artemas Ward had offered to permit British surgeons to cross the lines and attend wounded soldiers held captive. Surely, commented a "Gentleman of Rank" from New England, such evidence of American humanity militated against the accuracy of the scalping charge. The Annual Register picked up the same justification. The Virginia

Gazette published a friendly English account arguing "that 'although the king's troops began the bloody business, and thus provoked the provincials to a rage that might have justified merciless revenge, yet the provincials behaved with unparalleled moderation, and had exercised every virtuous office humanity could suggest to such of the king's troops as had fallen into their hands.'"13

In time knowledge of the incident seemed to fade, though it may be more accurate to say that many Americans were happy to see it recede from memory. Neither Ezra Ripley nor Lemuel Shattuck, who wrote detailed accounts of the day of Lexington and Concord in the early nineteenth century, mentioned it. They both laid great stress on British atrocities and could scarcely have missed reference to the scalping incident in their research. It was the flareup in 1835 of the dispute between Lexington and Concord over credit for beginning the Revolution that led Josiah Adams, who defended Lexington's claims, to recall Concord's fall from grace.¹⁴ Later in the century Grindall Reynolds claimed on the authority of Chaplin Joseph Thaxter that the British victim first thrust at the boy with his bayonet before receiving the blow, though no contemporary source would support his contention.¹⁵ Charles Hudson's History of Lexington confined the affair to a footnote but thought it serious enough to warrant explanation. "The act," he wrote in a vain effort to close the issue, "was committed by a rash young man, acting from the impulse of the moment, who regretted it to his dying day. It was condemned by all parties at the time, and had never been justified by anyone." And then redundantly: "It was an act of an individual, without orders from any in authority." Of course he was nearly right (at least no

contemporary had justified the act) but surely he protested too much.¹⁶

Even more interesting than the evasions and bogus additions by later historians is the identity of the axe-wielder. The contemporary sources were silent, as were all the later accounts, although there can be no doubt that town residents knew the name. As late as the 1920s, Allen French reported that older townspeople knew the young man but preferred not to be questioned about him. For a century and a half he had been shielded for his regrettable, "savage" act. Not until recent times did Amelia Forbes Emerson, the editor of the diaries of her ancestor the Reverend William Emerson, reveal the name. According to Emerson the act was committed by Ammi White, "a young fellow of twenty-one from Captain Brown's Company." Other sources hint that he might have been retarded, explaining the reluctance to expose him. But the entire pattern of American sensitivity on the subject points to the nature of the act itself and the interpretation placed on it by the British as equally important.¹⁷

Needless to say, for the British the ostensible scalping incident was not an isolated event. It conformed a pattern of behavior they had learned to expect in the New World. The soldiers who accompanied Braddock in 1755 feared the consequences of wilderness fighting long before they panicked at the French and Indian attack. Rumors of scalping and torture by "savage" Indians had been rife among the British regiments even while preparations were being made for the ill-fated general's expedition to the forks of the Ohio. The French and Indian War may or may not have been crucial in the formation of British attitudes toward fighting in America, but there can be no

doubt that the conviction that conflict in America was more brutal than European warfare, a reversion to an atavistic mode of conduct form which Europeans had long since been rescued by the onset of civilization, had deep roots in the European image of America.¹⁸

Thus when the British forces made their way along the road from Concord, they knew what to expect. At least General Gage knew. In early March one of his informers told him that the Americans were certain to fight as "detatched parties of Bushmen" whose firelocks could hit the mark at 200 yards (the distance something of an exaggeration). The American opposition "would be irregular impetuous and incessant from the numerous Bodys that would swarm to the place of action, and all actuated by an enthusiasm wild and ungovernable...." The British need not worry about the New England farmers mounting a formal military resistance. There was not a man among them capable of commanding an army. "A regular encampment seems abhorrent to the genius and inclination of the People." But the British should know that they have a great deal to fear from the "patience and cunning" of these farmers who will fight from ambush and take a terrible toll on the light infantry. Gage, who had been with Braddock in 1755, could only have been reminded of that clash in the forest that had caused such havoc among the regular forces. In fact his report of Lexington and Concord with its identification of the Americans with the "savage" Indians, made it plain that he saw the connection.¹⁹

When the ordeal was over and the troops safe behind their defenses other observers recalled the relationship between America and savagery. "The rebels," wrote Admiral Samuel Graves, a British officer whom the Americans roundly hated and who returned the

compliment, "followed the Indian manner of fighting, concealing themselves behind hedges [and] trees and skulking in woods and houses...." The "skulking" image turned up again and again. Lieutenant Colonel Smith, wounded himself by one of the skulkers, thought the American behavior most ungallant. They made not one gentlemanly stand the whole day. One of the common soldiers said in exasperation that they had fought like bears. As a more perceptive commentator put it, the "country people" had not been "brought up in our military way" and thus fought in a manner befitting the character of their untamed country. It was left to Lord Percy, who reported the same "scattered, irregular manner" of fighting, to place the American tactics in historical context. Among the rebel leadership were old soldiers who had been "employed as Rangers ag[ain]st the Indians & Canadians." Furthermore "this country being much cov[ere]d w[ith] wood, and hilly, is very advantageous for their method of fighting." The rumors of scalping may have been the most glaring evidence of the American descent into savagery, but it struck most Englishmen as no more than could be expected in the New World.²⁰

Soon after Lexington and Concord evidence mounted that the Americans had compounded their crime of behaving like Indians. Native warriors from Stockbridge had joined the patriot forces dug-in around Boston and could be relied upon to contribute their own peculiar brand of "savage" conduct. One can doubt whether these inhabitants of the last of the "praying towns" were any more adept at "savage" war than New England farmers, but in joining the fray they awakened memories of a century and a half of warfare between Europeans and native Americans, memories that confirmed the British conviction that

fighting in America differed sharply from the civilized conflict they believed to be cultivated in Europe.²¹

The connection made by British soldiers between America and the tactics of savagery assumes greater meaning when seen in relationship to late eighteenth-century developments in military practice. In part as a consequence of the irregular brand of warfare encountered in Eastern Europe at mid-century and after, and no doubt deriving justification from the long experience of the British military in the New World, European tacticians advocated the introduction of "light troops" that would operate in small groups, move swiftly in familiar country, and through maneuver and diversion exploit the potential of the terrain. These early guerrilla forces would also be expected to adopt the more ruthless mode of warfare associated with partisan conflict. Although this development in military tactics may have originated in Europe, there can be no doubt that British soldiers had experienced similar behavior in America and that once confronted by ill-disciplined farmers who fought with the means at hand, they readily identified this irregular military conduct with the American continent and the "savage" Indians.²²

Although the Americans reacted quickly to set the record straight on the issue of scalping, they were not entirely unhappy with the more general association made between themselves and the native people. Soon after the opening of hostilities, a correspondent from Philadelphia doubted that Parliament could establish its supremacy in America by force. Both the size of the American population and the layout of the country made British success unlikely. Furthermore, drawing on the recent experience west of Boston, he found more

immediate tactical reasons for the difficulty of the British task. The American riflemen, he maintained, were used to fighting in the woods; they would never be drawn into an open engagement. "They are very expert at the Indian manner of fighting; you see by the papers how they cut off the regulars." They employed, as another writer put it, "the Yankee way of bush-fighting." The term, he claimed, might be used in derision now, but it is an Indian word meaning conqueror applied, by the native people to the forefathers of the colonists. A letter from Portsmouth, New Hampshire, printed in the Virginia Gazette, expressed pleasure that Israel Putnam, prominent among the American leadership before Boston could boast of experience in the Indian manner of fighting. In the war against the French he had been wounded some fifteen times. Furthermore he had been taken prisoner by Indians, scalped, and tied to a tree, ready for torture, before being saved by a French officer. "Such a man is every way qualified to command a set of virtuous provincials." And he might have added, provincials whose virtue consisted precisely in their ability to oppose British tyranny with the mode of warfare peculiar to America.²³

But the colonists were clearly torn over the significance of Indian-like behavior. If it meant bushwhacking regulars, refusing to play the game of war by European standards, keeping one's head down at crucial moments, or clearing out in the face of a bayonet charge, then the point was clear enough. To defend their liberties, Americans had the good sense to adopt the lessons learned in the New World from an admittedly "savage" enemy. And yet the strategem involved more than simple practicality. Their appropriation of Indian methods confirmed the identity of the American cause with the new continent and its

separation from the corruptions and decadence of Europe. It did not mean, however, that they were above using the image of the savage for more than one purpose. When the British soldiers behaved brutally, the Americans leveled the same sort of criticism at them that had been directed at the patriots for their supposed lapse into savagery at Concord Bridge. In fact the private savagery of both sides was reciprocal. Convinced that the Americans had scalped the wounded and harassed by irregulars on their return to Boston the British troops were "irritated...to a fury of madness and they plundered and committed every wanton wickedness that a brutal revenge could stimulate...."²⁴

Provoked or not, the regulars who made that terrible journey from Lexington to Charlestown on the afternoon of April 19, 1775, could be expected to react vigorously against the farmers and mechanics who fired at them from any obstacle that offered protection. They were not, one supposes, inclined to be squeamish in avenging the dead and wounded who fell from ranks throughout the afternoon. Nor, given the tactics adopted by the patriots, did they feel any immediate obligation to adhere to the rules of civilized war. They burned property, killed and wounded non-combatants, and left a wake of havoc in their haste to reach safety. But once again the point is not so much what the troops actually did or what the Americans said they did as the meaning attributed to the British actions by the patriots.

This "fury of madness" that characterized British conduct on the road from Lexington did shock the colonists. The acts, after all, had been committed by "Britons famed for humanity and tenderness." What had transformed these protectors of civil order into plunderers of

property and butchers of the innocent? The patriots found the answer in the object of British policy. Believing that the ministry intended to reduce the colonists to "absolute slavery," the Americans came easily to the conviction that the methods used to achieve this end would be of the most brutal sort. But more important they assumed that in abandoning constitutional limitations the British would readily forsake all color of civilized behavior. They would in effect put themselves in league with the "savage" Indians "whose known rule of warfare," Jefferson was soon to proclaim in the Declaration of Independence, "is an undistinguished destruction of all ages, sexes, and conditions."²⁵

And that for the patriots was exactly what had occurred. British atrocities, they claimed, were "also beyond description; such as plundering and burning of dwelling-houses and other buildings, driving into the street women in child-bed; killing old men in houses unarmed." "The savage barbarity exercised upon the bodies of our unfortunate bretheren who fell is almost incredible. Not content with shooting down [the] unarmed, aged, and infirm, they disregarded the cries of the wounded, killing them without mercy, and mangling their bodies in the most shocking manner." The American commentators outdid themselves in recounting the terror and cruelties of that afternoon.²⁶

When powers of description waned, the list of atrocities and indignities exhausted, they resorted to comparison. Within days William Gordon heard from eyewitnesses that the troops had behaved "worse than the Indians." They were "more savage than heathens, or any other creatures, and it is generally thought, than devils." "An ancient Pict, or wild Indian, savage in their natures [the soldiery

apparently was not], would blush a shudder at such proceedings." To find comparable "circumstances of cruelty," one would have to recall the treatment endured by the Americans' ancestors "from the vilest Savages of the wilderness." Toward the end of the war, in a commemoration of Lexington and Concord, Zabdiel Adams offered a retrospective mediation using the familiar comparison. "No doubt, he told his congregation, greater deeds of barbarism have been committed "against the Americans by the aboriginals of the country." But the Indians acted as one might expect. They were, after all, "Untutored and destitute of civilization, they always made war with every circumstance of ferocity; it was their nature and agreeable to their modes and habits of life." Besides they had cause for their actions. They had been dispossessed by the early colonists and fought to save their way of life. But no such extenuation can justify the conduct of the British. They became barbarians without excuse. God himself had punished them for their fall from grace: "he had given the cause to America." A generation later the old tales of British atrocities retained their credibility for Mercy Warren. The "barbarities ... committed by the kings army," she wrote, "might have been expected only from a tribe of savages."²⁷

Thus in the opening clash of the war the Indian became an important issue in the dispute. He was not significant simply because he took part in the conflict, although the native role in attacking the frontier settlements did intensify the American belief that the Indian was a major antagonist of liberty and civil order. More important was the Indian's symbolic role in which he could serve as both the antithesis of republican liberty and as its idealization.

Both the Americans and the British made use of this dual symbolization throughout the war. In one sense, of course, such a resort could be considered no more than a handy instrument of propaganda. But the point is that propaganda of the sort can have meaning only if its substance is deeply felt by those who use it as well as by those against whom it is directed. If the Indian had not been an issue of long standing significance in the European and American perception of the New World, he would not have served so well as the ideological foil of both crown and patriot.

Once the British-American division moved beyond the quarrel over constitutional issues such as taxation and became instead a dispute over the very ground of public order the symbolic Indian was bound to assume significance. The identification of liberty with the new continent, an idea dear to the hearts of Americans and many English whigs, placed the Indian, and the mode of life often attributed to him, in the forefront of the controversy. In the sense that the native represented pristine nature, innocence, and freedom, he served as the antithesis of European decadence, corruption and despotism. In the propaganda exchange that followed the clash at Lexington and Concord, this version of the symbolic Indian justified the American mode of fighting against the ministerial troops bent on making "slaves" of the colonists. Because they fought without the formal discipline that inhibited the British, the plain New England farmers not only gained the victory but upheld the special virtues of America, virtues that the native people embodied to the highest perfection. In this sense the Americans welcomed identification with native ways.

And yet they were far more sensitive to the negative side of the

native image. In the century and a half that preceded the Revolution, the Indian had made his mark on the Anglo-American imagination as an implacable opponent of the transplantation of English society to America. As a consequence the Indian had early been seen as an ignoble savage, the enemy of civil order. In addition, over the years of imperial conflict many of the native warriors had fought on the French side and had thus become identified in English and American thinking not only with the forces of savagery but with European despotism and the Antichrist. It was a considerable symbolic burden for the Indian to bear. But more important, when the British seemed about to shift the weight of "savage" guilt from the Indian to the patriots, the Americans mounted a prompt defense designed to dissociate themselves from any vestige of "savage" conduct. The scalping incident obviously touched a sensitive nerve, for it seriously undermined the integrity of the Americans' cause. They could not defend liberty and at the same time countenance the sort of behavior that in their minds had come to distinguish the activities of the principal indigenous enemies of liberty. In addition they quickly seized the high ground in the propaganda war, accusing the British of all manner of barbarous actions on the march from Concord. It became a matter of ideological certainty that the British had thrown in their lot with the Indians and their tactics on April 19 offered the Americans irrefutable evidence of the truth of this charge.

And indeed the Americans were soon to have a great deal more evidence to support their position. Although the native warriors never became a decisive factor in the war, they did take part, mostly on the British side. In gaining the native allegiance, the British

had the advantage of an already functioning Indian department with strong ties to the tribes, and they benefited from the realization among many of the native peoples that tribal interests would not be served by American success.²⁸ Sensing this reality, the Continental Congress applied pressure to keep the tribes neutral, but most soon drifted into the conflict. After mid-1777 the northern frontier was aflame, the settlers driven back from their advanced posts, leading in 1779 to Washington's decision to detach a portion of his army to settle the Indian problem permanently. General John Sullivan's expedition into the Iroquois country failed to achieve this end, though it did raise the level of destruction and bloodshed in the frontier regions.²⁹ Throughout the war the small Kentucky settlements suffered constant harassment from native bands instigated and supplied from Detroit. George Rogers Clark's plan to capture that town and thus cut off the Indians at their source of supply failed after his initial success in the Illinois country. He never managed to relieve the pressure on his Kentucky compatriots.³⁰ In the South the Virginia and North Carolina militia struck so forcefully in 1776 that, except for a flareup in the spring of 1779 among the dissident Cherokees, the frontier remained peaceful though tense.³¹ The British might not have done any better at fomenting native opposition to the rebellion in the South than they had in organizing loyalist support, but during the War for Independence the southern frontier remained the scene of intermittent border conflict and of heightened tension between white and Indian.

As a result, the pattern established at Lexington and Concord persisted throughout the war period. The image of the savage

continued to serve both sides in their need for self-justification and in the barrage of propaganda that so intensified the bitterness of the hostilities. The Americans usually had the better of these exchanges, in part because of their failure to attract major native support, but perhaps more pertinently because their own self-image and their attitudes toward Europe were more profoundly enmeshed in the problem of the Indian. The Americans retained the edge because thinking "Indian" had become second nature to them. In their struggle for independence, they fused revolutionary fervor, dependent in great measure on the belief that the English conspired to destroy liberty, with the fear and loathing that had long been associated in the colonial experience with the idea of the savage. Thus throughout the war the Indian remained an issue.

In the northern theater he turned up almost immediately. On the invasion of Canada a contingent of native warriors joined Montgomery's force and provoked accusations of savagery from the British. Simultaneously patriots in the Albany area worried over the supposed machinations of John Johnson, who was reputed to be in the process of organizing the Indians for an attack on the patriot towns. In fact it was more than a year before Joseph Brant, Guy Johnson, and the Butlers would be successful in bringing together the Iroquois warriors with loyalist bands to make life extremely uncomfortable on the northern frontier. These efforts culminated in the attacks on the Wyoming and Cherry Valleys in the summer and fall of 1778. The exposed positions of the border posts and the incompetence of the patriot leadership led to two serious defeats that quickly became part of the American legend of British and loyalist atrocities. Joseph Brant, although present

only at Cherry Valley, assumed in American thinking the role of principal villain.³²

The tension on the northern frontier and the American fear of Indian reprisal had been aggravated by General John Burgoyne's ill-fated plunge toward Albany in the summer and fall of 1777. He was accompanied by a substantial contingent of Indians whose role it was to scout for the heavily encumbered British army. Without his native auxiliaries Burgoyne would have been virtually blind in the wilderness country between Montreal and Albany. Burgoyne was alive to the problem of Indian allies, but he seemed to want to have it both ways. At the same time that he trumpeted to any potential enemies the terrible fighting prowess of the warriors, he expended much bloated eloquence in cautioning the Indians to keep their activities within the bounds of civilized war. The result was to make an issue out of the presence of the tribesmen. When a young woman named Jane McCrea, the fiancée of one of Burgoyne's loyalist officers, was murdered by the Indians, the Americans made full use of the propaganda opening. No doubt Burgoyne would have been trapped and defeated anyway. He had moved dangerously beyond his base of supply and had lost the room for maneuver. But in relying so vocally and publicly on the Indians (they abandoned him when the going became rough), he ignited among the patriots a numerous and determined opposition.³³

Neither Washington nor his advisers took these scattered clashes on the frontier as crucial to the outcome of the war. Despite many pleas that something be done, it was 1779 before Sullivan moved against the Iroquois. While the main force struck north from the Susquehanna, other branches of the expedition attacked along the

Allegheny and the Mohawk. In military terms Sullivan accomplished little. Only one indecisive battle was fought and the power of the Iroquois remained unbroken, although the continentals managed to destroy much native property. The raid did, however, lend substance to the American war against savagery. When Sullivan's officers pledged before embarking on the campaign, "Civilization or death to all American Savages," they made clear the meaning of the conflict in their own minds and the significance attached to it by the beleaguered frontier.³⁴

While Sullivan burned Iroquois villages and crops, George Rogers Clark was to have mounted an attack on Detroit. Clark neither reached the town nor relieved the pressure on the Kentucky settlements, but he did clear the British out of the Illinois country temporarily and he captured Henry Hamilton at Vincennes. His success, as a consequence, was more propagandistic than strategic.

By 1779 Hamilton had become infamous on the American side as an officer who instigated Indian attacks on white settlements and paid for scalps. In Clark's opinion he was "the famous hair buyer general," guilty of both the betrayal of civilization and wanton attacks on American liberty. As a result Clark only reluctantly granted the British officer the usual civilities of surrender. He believed that Hamilton and the "partisan" frontiersmen captured with him deserved summary treatment. So also did Governor Thomas Jefferson who loaded Hamilton with irons and confined him to the common jail when he arrived in Williamsburg. Jefferson argued more cogently than Clark, but in similar terms, that Hamilton's alliance with the native people and his calculated use of uncivil modes of warfare placed him

beyond the protection of the usual rules governing conflict among nations. For Jefferson, Hamilton proved to be a heaven-sent opportunity to explain once again the meaning of the Revolution. In addition to representing the British assault on American liberty, Hamilton symbolized for Jefferson the denial of nature that he found in the condition of the ignoble savage.³⁵

While the patriot vision of the ignoble savage predominated throughout the war, the Americans were plainly ambivalent in their attitudes toward the native people. Clark may have accused Hamilton of all manner of crimes against civil order, but at the same time he found Indian-like behavior irresistible. He and his men consciously dressed and armed themselves like Indians, ate and danced in the Indian manner, gave the war whoop, and took scalps--of Indians if not Englishmen. Hamilton and his men conducted themselves similarly. Nor was the phenomenon confined to the frontier. Washington's attitudes on the subject may well have been influenced by the appearance of Daniel Morgan and his men when they joined the siege of Boston, or perhaps he remembered his experience in the French and Indian War, but he promoted the use of "light troops" accoutered in Indian style, encouraged the use of the war whoop, and was altogether pleased that his British enemies should fear the patriots in the same way they had learned in the past to fear "savage" enemies in the New World. In the South in 1780 this frontier attitude moved east of the mountains. The men from the West under John Sevier trapped and defeated Major Patrick Ferguson at Kings' Mountain in South Carolina. Ferguson had called them "barbarians" and had predicted that they would behave in an uncivilized manner. He was not far wrong. Many looked the Indian

part, and they gave the war whoop when they charged Ferguson's lines. They gave quarter only reluctantly, though they claimed this was in response to Tarleton's practice in the southern campaign, and they defiled Ferguson's body. Even without the memory of generations of desperate frontier conflict, it was a brutal war.³⁷ It became more so to the degree that the Americans imitated what they took to be the Indian way. The British expressed their abhorrence of the practice, but the activities of their loyalist and native allies blunted the sting of their criticism.

The revolutionary years ended with two connected incidents that contributed a certain poignant resolution to the problem of the Indian for the founding generation. In the early spring of 1782 the militia of Washington County, Pennsylvania, under David Williamson crossed the Ohio in search of hostile Indians. They found instead Moravian converts at Gnadenhutten and proceeded to slaughter ninety-six people. Later in the year the Delawares and Shawnees dispersed a follow-up expedition and captured the commander, Colonel William Crawford, a prominent citizen of western Pennsylvania and a friend of Washington. The Indians brutally tortured and killed Crawford, claiming that they sought vengeance for the murder of the Moravians. The Americans (except for the Moravian missionaries) of course tended to stress Crawford's death while ignoring the provocation.³⁸ The process had a way of coming full circle. The brutality anticipated at Concord Bridge, as it had in the past, became the reality.

Notes

1. James Axtell, "The Indian in American History: The Colonial Period" (unpublished paper, 1984), 17.
2. Lawrence Henry Gipson, The Great War for Empire: The Victorious Years, 1758-1760 (New York, 1949), 7: 129-30.
3. Axtell, "Indian in American History," 17. The same argument underlines his assertion that "the adults who chose to become Indians did so for some of the reasons that many of their countrymen turned to revolution"; see Axtell, The European and the Indian: Essays in the Ethnohistory of Colonial North America (New York, 1981), 361, n.78.
4. Bernard W. Sheehan, "The Problem of Moral Judgments in History," South Atlantic Quarterly (1985), 37-50.
5. Richard M. Nixon, Leaders/Richard Nixon (New York, 1982), 74.
6. Allen French, The Day of Concord and Lexington: The Nineteenth of April, 1775 (Boston, 1925), 211-14; Arthur Bernon Tourtellot, Lexington and Concord: The Beginning of the War of the American Revolution (New York, 1963), 159-68; Frank Warren Coburn, The Battle of April 19, 1775..., 2nd ed., rev. (Port Washington, N.Y., 1970), 88-89, and note 2; Robert A. Gross, The Minutemen and Their World (New York, 1976), 126-127.
7. Smith to Gage, April 22, 1775, Mass.Hist.Soc., Proc. 14 (May 1876), 350; Percy to Gage, April 20, 1775, Letters of Hugh Earl Percy from Boston and New York, 1774-1776, Charles Knowles Bolton, ed. (Boston, 1902), 50-51; Thomas Gage, "Circumstantial Account," American Archives, Peter Force, ed., 4th ser., 5 vols. (Washington, 1837-44), 2: 435-36; Gage to Lord Dunmore, May 20,

- 1775, ibid., 437; Allen French, General Gage's informers... (Ann Arbor, 1932), 106-107.
8. For Abercrombie, see Mass.Hist.Soc., Proc., 2nd ser., 11 (1896-97), 306; Lister is quoted in Gage's Informers, 80; the account of the officer can be found in Force, ed., American Archives, 4th ser., 2: 517. See also, letter to Lord Sandwich, May 31, 1775, ibid., 2: 862-864; William Sutherland and Richard Pope, Late News of the Excursion and Ravages of the King's Troops on the Nineteenth of April, 1775, Harold Murdock, ed. (Cambridge, Mass., 1927), 21.
 9. [John Lind], An Answer to the Declaration of the American Congress (London, 1776), 101-102, 107-110; [John Moir], Obedience the Best Charter; or, Law the Only Sanction of Liberty. In a Letter to the Rev. Dr. Price (London, 1776), 55-6, note.
 10. Margaret Wheeler Willard, ed., Letters on the American Revolution, 1774-1776 (Boston, 1925), 77; Peter Oliver, Origin & Progress of the American Rebellion: A Tory View, Douglas Adair and John A. Schutz, eds. (San Marino, Ca., 1961), 120. English Whigs, it should be noted, resisted the stories of American savagery at Lexington and Concord, though they would soon make a great deal out of the British-Indian alliance. For 1775 the Annual Register passed off as "exaggerated" the accusations of "inhuman cruelties" by both American and British troops: see David Murdoch, ed., Rebellion in America; A Contemporary British Viewpoint, 1765-1783 (Santa Barbara, Ca., 1979), 258-259.
 11. Force, ed., American Archives, 4th ser., 2: 674.

12. Ibid., 630; William Gordon, The History of the Rise, Progress and Establishment of the Independence of the United States of America... 3 vols. (New York, 1801), 1: 311-2.
13. Willard, ed., Letters on the American Revolution, 93; Murdoch, Rebellion in America, 259; Virginia Gazette (Pinckney), August 31, 1775.
14. Harold Murdock, "The British at Concord--April 19, 1775," Mass. Hist. Soc., Proc. 56 (1922-1923), 90-1; French, Gage's Informers, 107-109.
15. Grindall Reynolds, Concord, Fight, April 19, 1775 (Boston, 1875), 19.
16. Charles Hudson, History of the Town of Lexington, Middlesex County, Massachusetts..., rev. ed., 2 vols. (Boston, 1913), 1: 162n. In "The Old Manse," Hawthorne used the authority of James Russell Lowell and his own fertile imagination to describe the young man's mental state as he lifted the axe: "it must have been a nervous impulse, without purpose, without thought, and betokening a sensitive and impressible nature, rather than a hardened one..." See William Charvat, et al., eds., The Centenary Edition of the Works of Nathaniel Hawthorne, 14 vols. (Columbus, Ohio, 1962-), 10: 10.
17. French, Gage's Informers, 109; Coburn, The Battle of April 19, 1775, 88-89, and note; Amelia Forbes Emerson, ed., Diaries and Letters of William Emerson, 1743-1776 (n.p., n.d.), 74; Murdock, "The British at Concord," 88.
18. Paul E. Kopperman, Braddock at the Monongahela (Pittsburgh, 1977), 91-2, 229, 254, 266-7; Stanley Pargellis, ed., Military

- Affairs in North America, 1748-1765... (New York, 1935), 123.
19. French, Day of Concord, 57-8, attributes the memo to Gage. But see Clarence Edwin Carter, ed., The Correspondence of General Thomas Gage with the Secretaries of State, 1763-1775, 2 vols. (New Haven, 1931), 1: 349n, which claims that the intelligences were the observations of Gage's informers. Force, ed., American Archives, 4th ser., 2: 435-6.
 20. K. G. Davies, ed., Documents of the American Revolution, 1770-1783 (Dublin, 1975), 9: 105, 146-7; Mass. Hist. Soc., Proc. 14 (1876), 351; Virginia Gazette (Pinckney), May 11, 1775; Force, ed., American Archives, 4th ser., 2: 440; Bolton, ed., Letters of Percy, 52-3.
 21. Massachusetts Gazette, May 25, 1775; Virginia Gazette (Dixon and Hunter), August 26, 1775.
 22. See Peter E. Russell, "Redcoats in the Wilderness: British Officers and Irregular Warfare in Europe and America, 1740-1760," William and Mary Quarterly, 3rd ser., 35 (1978), 629-52.
 23. Willard, ed., Letters on the American Revolution, 85, 94-5; Virginia Gazette (Dixon and Hunter), August 12, 1775.
 24. Willard, ed., Letters on the American Revolution, 78.
 25. Force, ed., American Archives, 4th ser., 2: 369-70, 377, 673-4.
 26. See, for example, ibid., 384, 392, 401, 433, 439, 673-4; Connecticut Courant, April 24, 1775; Essex Gazette, April 25, 1775; Amos Farnsworth, "Diary," Mass. Hist. Soc., Proc., 2nd ser., 12 (1897-1899), 78.
 27. Force, ed., American Archives, 4th ser., 2: 391, 508, 630, 679; Zabdiel Adams, The Evil Designs of Men Made Subservient by God to

the Public Good... (Boston, 1783), 14-15; Mercy Warren, History of the Rise, Progress and Termination of the American Revolution (Boston, 1805), 1: 186-7. In a letter to Governor John Trumbull of Connecticut, Gage saw fit to defend his troops against charges that they committed "barbarous outrages" against the Massachusetts populace. In investigating the matter, he claimed to have found examples of the regulars' "tenderness" but no evidence on "cruelty or barbarity." He felt obliged to add that he had "no command to ravage the country": Force, ed., American Archives, 4th ser., 2: 482.

28. On the question of Indian involvement in the war, see Jack M. Sosin, "The Use of Indians in the War of the American Revolution: A Re-Assessment of Responsibility," Canadian Historical Review 46 (1965), 101-21; Jack M. Sosin, The Revolutionary Frontier, 1763-1783 (New York, 1967), 87; Andrew McFarland Davis, "The Employment of Indian Auxiliaries in the American War," English Historical Review 2 (1887), 709-28.
29. Barbara Graymont, The Iroquois in the American Revolution (Syracuse, 1972), ch. 8.
30. Sosin, Revolutionary Frontier, 110-12, 137-41.
31. James H. O'Donnell III, "The Southern Indians in the War for American Independence 1775-1783," in Charles M. Hudson, ed., Four Centuries of Southern Indians (Athens, Ga., 1975), 51.
32. Sosin, Revolutionary Frontier, 115-16.
33. John Burgoyne, A State of the Expedition from Canada (London, 1780); on Jane McCrea see, Philip Davidson, Propaganda and the American Revolution, 1763-1783 (Chapel Hill, 1941), 372.

34. Frederick Cook, ed., Journals of the Military Expedition of Major General John Sullivan against the Six Nations (Auburn, NY., 1887); for the quotation, see ibid., 60.
35. Bernard W. Sheehan, "'The Famous Hair Buyer General': Henry Hamilton, George Rogers Clark, and the American Indian," Indiana Magazine of History 79 (March 1983), 1-28.
36. Washington to Patrick Henry, Oct. 5, 1776, Writtings of George Washington, John C. Fitzpatrick, ed., 39 vols. (Washington D.C., 1931-44), 6: 166; Don Higginbotham, Daniel Morgan: Revolutionary Rifleman (Chapel Hill, 1961), 26.
37. Hank Messick, King's Mountain (Boston, 1976), ch. 6.
38. C. W. Butterfield, An Historical Account of the Expedition against Sandusky under Col. William Crawford... (Cincinnati, 1873).

Indians and the American Revolution: Approaches to Teaching

Mary Beth Norton

Cornell University

I disagree thoroughly with Professor Sheehan's approach to the study of Indians in the Revolutionary era. There is nothing wrong per se with what he has said; I just don't think it is the whole story and it is certainly not the story of Indians and the Revolution.

Let's look briefly at Sheehan's approach as he has just presented it: he has taken importance in the world of white men as the general measure of importance overall. The implicit assumption behind his remarks is that the Revolution was a white event and that Indians are important only insofar as they can be revealed to have had an impact on that white event.

Thus Professor Sheehan derives his main theme: that the most important role the Indian played in the Revolution was the "symbolic role in which he could serve as both the antithesis of republican liberty and as its idealization." That may have been the most important role in the minds of whites (though as a modern resident of the area devastated by the Sullivan Expedition, I'm not so sure I would dismiss it or other frontier fighting as quickly as Sheehan does), but it was definitely not the most important role if we look at the Revolution from another perspective altogether--that of the Indians themselves.

To achieve that perspective, I would reverse the crucial historical question Professor Sheehan has posed. Instead of inquiring, What impact did Indians have on the events of the

Revolutionary era? I ask, What impact did the events of the Revolutionary era have on Indians (and whites, and blacks, and men, and women)? The answer to that question--or series of questions--is quite different from the answer to his question, and it requires us to take a radically different approach to studying the era.

It requires us to see all the peoples living in North America at the time of the Revolution as historical actors in their own right with divergent concerns and interests.

It requires us to ask parallel questions that are race- and sex-differentiated, thus being sensitive to the differential impacts of the Revolution on different North Americans.

It requires us not to assume implicitly or explicitly that the experience of the white-male minority is more important than the separate experiences of the majority of the people of North America. Other people do not gain historical importance solely as they influence (or fail to influence) white males!

Finally, it requires us not to assume implicitly or explicitly that white males are the norm, and that all other experiences are somehow abnormal variants of the white-male experience--or important only insofar as they resemble the white-male experience (and therefore the least similar experiences appear to be the least significant).

Applying these principles to the study of the Revolutionary era produces quite a different conclusion from Professor Sheehan's. The syllabus for History 325 and my chapters in A People and a Nation (1-7) show how I have worked it out. Some brief substantive remarks:

1) French & Indian War: I discuss 4 separate sets of combatants: Indians (various tribes), white Americans, British,

French. Each had their own goals, aims, interests to protect, and the outcome of war meant different things for each group. I stress particularly for Indians the end of the strategy of balancing British and French off against each other that had worked since 1701, and deal with Pontiac's Uprising in this context.

2) Revolutionary war itself: again, I outline separate interests of Indians, white Americans, and British--what did each have to gain, or lose, from Indian involvement in the war? From the Indian standpoint, I emphasize the possible gains/losses of alliance with either side; from the white American viewpoint, I stress practical fears of Indian attacks on the frontier if troops were pulled off to fight on the seaboard (for example, Thomas Jefferson's trouble recruiting militia when he was governor of Virginia); from the British angle of vision, I note the drawbacks of an Indian alliance as well as the benefits.

3) Outcome of war: I comment on the great land losses suffered by tribes that allied themselves with the British, especially the Iroquois, and the consequent impact on women as well as men, the realignment of traditional lifestyles to more nearly resemble that of whites. (To me, this is one of the most fascinating impacts of the war.)

4) Postwar to 1815: I discuss the westward push of whites, the way the Indians of Old Northwest united to try to oppose them (but point out that they lacked the ability to use the old, successful balancing strategy employed by Indians to the east), including not only Little Turtle and the Miami Confederacy but also Tecumseh & the Prophet.

(I take this same sort of approach with blacks, white women, & indeed white men [seeing them explicitly as such] in this course and others I teach, but since this conference is about integrating the history of Indians into the rest of American history, I have stressed that aspect.)

Although I have presented this as I've done it in my advanced Revolution course, the principles are easily adaptable to basic surveys as well. It just requires asking questions in these different ways, ensuring that students are exposed to the Revolution as seen from an Indian (or black, or female) viewpoint as well as the more familiar white male one.

History 325
Age of the American Revolution, 1760-1815
Mary Beth Norton

I teach this course on Tuesdays and Thursdays, in 90-minute classes: a lecture on Tuesday and a discussion on Thursday. Enrollment, like this fall, normally hovers around 40 students. When I have more than 40, I qualify for a Teaching Assistant, and I then split the Thursday discussions into two sections, which the assistant and I teach alternate weeks. The lecture topics are listed below, with elaboration for all that include material on Indians. (I tend to emphasize the Iroquois not only because of the availability of material but also because Ithaca sits on the sight of a Cayuga village and upstate New York college students are quite interested in learning about the Indians of this region. In addition, most of the Native American students at Cornell are Iroquois.) Some topics take me more than 90 minutes to cover, others take less.

I generally assign a book, or a substantial portion of a book, each week. I vary the readings each year but usually stick to secondary materials. The only book on Indians I assign regularly is Anthony Wallace, The Death and Rebirth of the Seneca. Among the books I am using this year are Pauline Maier, The Old Revolutionaries; Gerald Mullin, Flight and Rebellion, my own Liberty's Daughters, Robert Gross, The Minutemen and Their World, Charles Royster, A Revolutionary People at War, Joseph Ellis, After the Revolution; and Joyce Appleby, Capitalism and the New Social Order.

List of Lecture Topics:

1. Household, Family, and Society
2. Colonial Politics and Political Thought
3. The Great War for the Empire
The first introduction of Indians, through a discussion of their strategic interests during the colonial wars beginning in 1689 and their decisions during the French and Indian War; the consequences of the war for Native Americans, as revealed by Pontiac's Uprising (described in parallel terms to the consequences of the war for whites, as revealed in the Stamp Act).
4. The Crisis of the 1760s
5. Changing Perceptions, 1768-1772
6. The Debate of 1774
7. The Creation of a Revolutionary Hegemony, 1774-1775

8. The Revolutionary War
Includes a discussion of British Indian policy in the 1760s as a prelude to an analysis of British, patriot, and Indian strategies for dealing with each of the other groups as the war began. Deals with why the patriots and the British both wanted the Indians to remain neutral, and why some Iroquois tribes eventually entered the war on the British side, while others supported the patriots. Considers the effect on the Iroquois Confederacy of the battle of Oriskany, in which some tribesmen were on each side, and of the Sullivan Expedition, which destroyed the Cayuga settlement where Ithaca now stands.
9. The Social Impact of the Revolution
Considers the effects of the Revolution on white men, white women, blacks, and Indians (as separate and distinct categories).
10. Republican Ideology
11. The Confederation Period
In my discussion of the Northwest Ordinances I point out that the Indians were still in control of that region and describe the difficulties whites encountered in trying to move very far from the Ohio River.
12. Governmental Reform: The Constitution
13. Republican Culture: Art and Literature
14. Partisan Politics and Foreign Policy in the 1790s
Includes an analysis of Indian diplomacy and warfare, especially the creation of the Miami Confederacy, the battle of Fallen Timbers (1794) and the Treaty of Greenville (1795).
15. Politics in the Era of Jefferson
16. The War of 1812
Discusses the aims of Tecumseh and The Prophet and Indian involvement in the war as well as the usual treatment of the Franco-British conflict after 1793, which eventually drew the U.S. into war with Great Britain.
17. Postrevolutionary Culture and Society
Wraps up many of the themes that have run through the course and provides a snapshot comparable to that of the first lecture. Includes, briefly, a portrait of Indian societies east of the Mississippi in the early years of the 19th century, points to the new pressure on Indian lands in both north and south caused by the great westward migration of whites and blacks after 1815.

Select Bibliography of Books on Indians in the Age of the American Revolution

The 1760s and Before

Thomas P. Abernethy, Western Lands and the American Revolution (1937, reprinted New York, 1959).

John R. Alden, John Stuart and the Southern Colonial Frontier...1754-1775 (Ann Arbor, 1944).

Richard Aquila, The Iroquois Restoration: Iroquois Diplomacy on the Colonial Frontier 1701-1754 (Detroit, 1983).

Georgianna C. Nammack, Fraud, Politics, and the Dispossession of the Indians: The Iroquois Land Frontier in the Colonial (Norman, 1969).

Howard H. Peckham, Pontiac and the Indian Uprising (Princeton, 1947).

Jack M. Sosin, Whitehall and the Wilderness: The Middle West in British Colonial Policy, 1760-1775 (Lincoln, 1961).

The Revolutionary War

Barbara Graymont, The Iroquois in the American Revolution (Syracuse, 1972).

Isabel T. Kelsay, Joseph Brant, 1743-1807: Man of Two Worlds (Syracuse, 1984).

James H. O'Donnell, III, Southern Indians in the American Revolution (Knoxville, 1973).

Postwar Years

Dorothy Jones, License for Empire: Colonialism by Treaty in Early America (Chicago, 1982).

Francis Paul Prucha, American Indian Policy in the Formative Years: The Indian Trade and Intercourse Acts 1790-1834 (Cambridge, MA, 1962).

Bernard Sheehan, Seeds of Extinction: Jeffersonian Philanthropy and the American Indian (Chapel Hill, 1973).

Anthony F. C. Wallace, The Death and Rebirth of the Seneca (New York, 1969).

Indians in Southern History

Theda Perdue

Clemson University

Historians of the American South have pointed to a number of themes in southern history including agrarianism, patriarchy, and poverty, but overshadowing these is the South's long experience with racial slavery. Yet most textbook treatments of southern Indians divorce them from this major theme in southern history. Removal of the five large Indian nations from the southeast is the only episode of their past that receives substantial attention, and that event is placed primarily in the context of Jacksonian democracy or the United States' westward expansion. Removal was, of course, a part of the westward movement of whites and a feature of national policy which also included native peoples outside the South. Nevertheless, the history of southern Indians is also intrinsically linked to the history of black and white southerners. Native Americans in the South cannot be understood apart from the plantation regime and its aftermath. Southern Indians have had to contend with a society whose economy was based on the cultivation of crops which could produce enormous profits and on the exploitation of nonwhite labor. They also have had to contend with a people obsessed with issues of race.

Commercially profitable agriculture and racial slavery early became features of white southern society in the English colonies. Tobacco proved to be the salvation of the Virginia colony and by the end of the seventeenth century, the labor of nonwhite slaves had

become the salvation of tobacco planters. Rice and indigo followed by cotton and sugar also became major products of slave labor which brought profits to the white South. For agriculture to be lucrative in the South, however, there had to be land and labor. Native peoples provided both.

From the British perspective, the land did not really belong to the Indians. The British based their claim to North America on the discoveries of the Cabots and others who explored the New World under the auspices of the British crown. People, of course, lived in this "new found" land, but the British insisted that the natives had only the right to occupy the land temporarily. Limitations on the Indians' right to the land stemmed from the perception of Indian peoples as wandering hunters and gatherers who did not cultivate the soil or permanently inhabit a particular tract of land. Discovery entailed the right of preemption, that is, the right to possess the land when the Indians moved on, died out, or conveyed their limited claim to the "discoverer." When Indians relinquished their right of occupancy, the "civilized" nation which had discovered the land could then settle it, put it to proper use, and establish legitimate ownership. The British, therefore, viewed Indian titles as transitory and European titles as genuine and permanent.¹

Self-interest no doubt shaped British definition of land titles and clouded their views of Indian culture. Observers overlooked or distorted important cultural characteristics, and, as a result, the inferiority or inadequacy which whites used to dispossess native peoples frequently had not existed in the first place. In particular, southern Indians were not wandering hunters as Europeans often

portrayed them but farmers living in permanent villages. For centuries before European contact, southeastern Indians depended on agriculture. Native peoples began to cultivate squash and gourds about 1000 B.C. and in approximately 200 B.C., corn and beans appeared on the scene. The broad fertile valleys of the Southeast, a long growing season, and an annual rainfall averaging from 40 to 64 inches made the Southeast admirably suited for agricultural economy. Agriculture made a stationary existence possible, and people built permanent houses, villages, and large earthen mounds which were a focus of an elaborate ceremonial life.²

The agricultural base of southeastern Indian societies permitted a fairly high population density. In Their Number Become Thinned: Native American Population Dynamics in Eastern North America, Henry F. Dobyns has suggested that some areas such as the gulf coast may have supported as many as 4.6 persons per kilometer for a total population of 1,100,000.³ Diseases took a heavy toll, particularly in the early years of exploration before native peoples had acquired some immunity to new European diseases. Even after epidemics, however, a substantial native population remained. In order to obtain the land belonging to these people for the expansion of their booming agricultural enterprises, southern whites had to eliminate them or terminate their right of occupancy.

War provided one solution for southerners. In 1622 the Powhatans rose up against the Virginia colonists who had been abusing and exploiting them for a decade and a half. Those colonists who survived the assault welcomed the opportunity to abandon their facade of friendliness and their concern for conversion in favor of simply

seizing the Indians' land. One rejoiced that the colonists were "set at liberty by the treacherous violence of the Sauvages. . . . Now their cleared grounds in all their villages (which are situate in the fruitfulest places of the land) shall be inhabited by us."⁴ This same scenario was repeated countless times in southern history: native peoples went to war in defense of their homelands only to meet defeat which Anglo-Americans then used to justify seizure of Indian lands.

War not only helped satisfy the southern planter's demand for land, but it also helped meet his demand for labor. Native prisoners of war often found themselves on the slave trader's auction block. In the seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries, many Indian slaves worked alongside Africans on southern plantations while others were exported to the West Indies. In 1708, for example, a South Carolina population of 9,850 included 2,900 African slaves and 1,400 Indian slaves. J. Leitch Wright in his recent work The Only Land They Knew: The Tragic Story of American Indians in the Old South speculates that many slaves listed as African on such censuses were in fact Indian and that the total number of Indian slaves reached "tens of thousands." Wright also suggests that the enslavement of so many Indians had a genetic and cultural impact on the people who came to be known as "American Negroes." Crafts, music, folklore, and other aspects of slave culture may have had native American as well as African origins. Furthermore, he thinks that Indian captives, who came from matrilineal societies, may have been responsible in part for the position of women in slave families.⁵

Indian slavery declined dramatically in the last half of the eighteenth century for several reasons. The enslavement of Indians involved an escalation in native warfare. By the end of the century, policy had come to focus on the temporary pacification of native peoples and the appropriation of the land by methods other than war. Wright suggests that the Indian population had been so depleted that slave raiding was no longer worth the trouble. Planters also feared collusion between free Indians and slaves, both Indian and black, and joint resistance to white oppression seemed at times to be a real possibility.⁶ An emerging racial ideology among southerners, perhaps partly prompted by this fear, increasingly separated Indians and Africans. Thomas Jefferson's comments on the two races in Notes on the State of Virginia provide a good example.⁷ While he recommended assimilation of Indians, Jefferson wrote that Afro-Americans were "inferior to the whites in the endowments both of body and mind" and that their color was a "powerful obstacle to the emancipation of these people." Jefferson and others regarded the Indian as culturally inferior but capable of change. The African could not change. The Indian was a "noble savage" whom "civilization" might save, but the African was an inferior being suitable only for service.

Many native peoples accepted this ideology. Southern society was becoming strictly biracial, and if they were given a choice between classification as "black" or "white" native peoples chose "white." As James Merrell has demonstrated in "The Racial Education of the Catawba Indians," Catawba antipathy towards blacks developed gradually. Merrell contends that by 1800, "Catawbas had become an anomaly. Neither useful nor dangerous, neither black nor white, they did not

fit into the South's expanding biracial society. . . . No official policy arose that forced the Catawbas to become blacks; but in a culture that recognized only two colors, the danger was always present, and the Catawbas became acutely sensitive to it. . . . Natives cast their lot with the dominant culture and strengthened the barrier separating them from blacks by adopting white racial attitudes."⁸

The fear of being classified as black may have been a factor which led to the cultural transformation of many southern Indians in the early nineteenth century. This transformation, most pronounced among the Cherokees, Chickasaws, Choctaws, and Creeks, took place under the United States' "civilization" program. Proclaiming that the Indian was doomed unless he abandoned his "savage" ways, government agents and missionaries descended on these nations in order to promote commercial agriculture, republican government, English education, and Christianity. While genuine altruism probably motivated some whites, the spectre of hunting grounds opened to white settlers after "civilized" Indians abandoned them no doubt accounts for much of the enthusiasm for Indian "civilization."

Many southern Indians readily accepted the government's "civilization" program. The descendants of white traders and Indian women already were accustomed to Euro-American ways and capitalized on the material aspects of the program. Also many men who formerly had engaged in hunting and war, no longer viable occupations, found an avenue for self-fulfillment and an outlet for aggression in the individualistic economic system and acquisitive values which agents introduced. These men whose ancestry was Indian plus others of mixed

ancestry became "civilized," or at least they acquired that "love for exclusive property" on which Washington's Secretary of War Henry Knox believed "civilization" rested. They began to cultivate many acres of commonly owned land, to build and furnish elegant homes, and to invest in toll roads, taverns, ferries, mills and even steamboats. They also bought black slaves.⁹

In the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, leadership of the southern tribes fell increasingly to individuals who were well on their way to acculturation. These were the people with whom United States agents and treaty commissioners interacted most easily. In some cases, more traditional Indians deferred to these progressives and looked to them as interpreters of U.S. policies and as mediators of culture. In other cases, however, government officials grossly overestimated the power of people who supported federal policies and failed to realize that they had little internal support.

Most federal officials viewed the "civilization" program as a means to an end: the real objective of U.S. Indian policy was the acquisition of Indian land. At first, prospects seemed bright. Hunting (and therefore the need for hunting grounds) declined in the late eighteenth century. The demise of trade as a viable occupation resulted in part from land cessions and the depletion of hunting grounds through overhunting or encroachments by white squatters. As Daniel Usner shows, however, in "American Indians on the Cotton Frontier: Changing Economic Relations with Citizens and Slaves in the Mississippi Territory," many private trading houses, and in particular the large British firm of John Forbes, began to shift their emphasis from deerskins to cotton. The invention of the cotton gin in the

1790s and the growth of the British textile industry made cotton a far more lucrative commodity than deerskins. Cotton production by whites grew dramatically after the War of 1812, and the demand increased for new cotton land, land which Indians claimed but which whites regarded as unnecessary to support a native population well on its way to "civilized" life.¹⁰

The United States pressured southern Indians to relinquish their "surplus" land in a variety of ways. The War Department authorized the construction of government owned trading posts, or factories, and instructed traders to permit Indians to run up sizeable accounts. Then authorities demanded payment in land. In 1802, for example, the federal government built a factory among the Chickasaws who within three years owed \$12,000. They paid their debts by ceding their territory north of the Tennessee River.¹¹ Treaty commissioners sent to negotiate land cessions bribed chiefs and exploited tribal factionalism. In the Cherokee removal crisis of 1806-09, for example, the federal government took advantage of discord between the upper towns of eastern Tennessee and western North Carolina and the lower towns of Alabama and Georgia. Lower towns were more committed to "civilization" and ultimate assimilation into white society. Espousing the political fiction of tribal unity, federal officials negotiated land cessions and exchanges with town chiefs in the name of the entire tribe. They also lubricated the process by bribing lower town chiefs with the inclusion of secret treaty provisions appropriating funds to particularly cooperative chiefs.¹² Treaty commissioners employed the same tactic in 1825 when they bribed William McIntosh and other progressive lower Creeks to cede tribal

lands in Georgia.¹³ In both cases, the Indian nations executed the miscreants, but considerable damage was done. While the President of the United States set aside the treaty McIntosh signed, a subsequent treaty achieved the same cession. Furthermore, the willingness of the federal government to use bribery and factionalism demoralized southern Indians and encouraged self-serving individuals to cede tribal land.

In response to these tactics, southern tribes began to devise ways of coping with the incessant demands for their land. With the hearty approval of the "civilizers," agents and missionaries, southern Indians adopted Anglo-American political institutions. The Cherokees, Creeks, Choctaws, and Chickasaws began to centralize their tribal governments, to formalize political processes and structures, to delegate authority to clearly designated chiefs, and to hold those chiefs accountable for their actions. Ceding land became a capital offense.

The national governments organized by these Indians also attempted to protect private property. National police forces and court systems dealt with theft and other property matters. Borrowing from their white neighbors, native legislators also enacted slave codes which restricted the activities of slaves, prohibited citizenship rights to children of Indians and blacks, and forbade intermarriage. At the same time that they were trying to protect themselves from the onslaught of southern whites, southern Indians increasingly adopted white racial attitudes and practices.

The slow pace of land acquisition and the obstacles erected by Indians angered many southerners. As cotton prices rose, the white

population in the South grew, and the Cotton Kingdom expanded, the desire for additional land suitable for cultivating cotton increased. Consequently, southern states began to demand that the federal government, which controlled Indian relations, liquidate Indian title to land within their borders. Georgia, in particular, insisted on federal compliance with the Compact of 1802. In this agreement, the state relinquished claims to the western land which became Alabama and Mississippi, and the federal government promised to extinguish Indian land titles within the state at some unspecified future time. In the 1820s, Georgians thought that the federal government had delayed long enough. Indian land promptly became a political issue. Constitutional changes in 1825 which provided for the direct election of governors (whom the State Senate previously elected) contributed to the uproar. Politicians seized upon Indian land as an issue with broad popular appeal. In 1826, Georgians rejoiced when the Creeks gave up their remaining land in the state and withdrew to Alabama. Then they turned their attention to the Cherokees.

In 1827, the Cherokees established a republican government with a written constitution patterned after that of the United States. Georgia interpreted this act to be a violation of state sovereignty and renewed her demands for the extinction of Indian land titles. The state legislature, wanting to make life so miserable for the Indians that they would leave, extended Georgia law over the Cherokees and created a special militia, the Georgia Guard, to enforce state law in the Cherokee country. Laws prevented Indians from testifying against whites in court and required all whites, including missionaries, to take an oath of allegiance to the state. The Georgia legislature

enjoined the Cherokee council from meeting and leaders from speaking publicly against removal. Finally, legislators formulated plans for a survey and division of Cherokee lands in preparation for their distribution to whites by lottery. Other southern states soon followed Georgia's lead and extended oppressive state laws over their Indian populations.

In his 1829 message to Congress, President Andrew Jackson offered southern Indians two alternatives--they could become subject to the discriminatory laws of the state or move west and continue their own tribal governments. The President and most southerners believed that they should move. In 1830, Congress passed the Indian Removal Act which authorized the President to negotiate exchanges of territory and appropriated \$500,000 for that purpose. Under the proposed removal treaties, the federal government would compensate emigrants for improvements (houses, cleared and fenced fields, barns, orchards, ferries, etc.) and assist them in their journey west.¹⁴

The Choctaws were the first tribe to go west under the provisions of the Indian Removal Act.¹⁵ In the fall of 1830, a group of Choctaw chiefs agreed to the Treaty of Dancing Rabbit Creek. In this treaty, the Choctaws ceded their land in the Southeast, but those who wished to remain in Mississippi (or could not pay their debts to citizens of the state) would receive fee simple title to individual allotments of land and become citizens of the state. The federal government promised those who removed reimbursement for improvements, transportation to the West, subsistence for one year after removal, and an annuity for the support of education and other tribal services. There was much dissatisfaction with the treaty, particularly among

Choctaw traditionalists who did not want to go west under any condition. Opponents had little opportunity to protest formally because the U.S. government refused to recognize any chief as long as the Choctaws remained in Mississippi. Consequently, the Choctaws began preparations for their westward migration.

Confusion surrounded these preparations and the journey west. After a dispute about routes, the Choctaws and the government agreed on a combination water and land route. Finally in late fall 1831, the first detachment of Choctaws left Mississippi. The War Department had divided the supervision of removal between an Indian trader who conducted the Indians to the Mississippi River and a Jacksonian Democrat who then assumed control. These men delegated their authority to supply the Indians to agents in the field. Many agents viewed removal only as an opportunity to increase their own fortunes, and so the Choctaws often failed to receive rations promised. The Indians who removed under government supervision suffered greatly as a result of winter weather, corruption, greed, and bureaucratic bungling, but so did those who received a \$10.00 commutation fee from the U.S. and paid fellow Choctaws to conduct them west. The later Choctaw removals of 1832 and 1833 were not as plagued by corruption and confusion, in part because military officials replaced civilian speculators as field agents. By the spring of 1834, between thirteen and fifteen thousand Choctaws had been removed.

About seven thousand Choctaws remained in Mississippi under provisions of the Treaty of Dancing Rabbit Creek. Either they were heads of household who registered to receive an allotment or they could not leave the state because of indebtedness. Some who remained

in Mississippi were highly acculturated Choctaws such as Greenwood LeFlore, who subsequently embarked on a successful career in Mississippi politics. Others, however, were traditionalists accustomed to communal ownership of land who did not understand titles, deeds, and individual ownership. Mary Young has described what happened to these people in Redskins, Ruffleshirts and Rednecks: Indian Allotment, in Alabama and Mississippi, 1830-1860.¹⁶

Frequently, traditionalists understood only their native language, and as a result, they became the unwitting victims of unscrupulous speculators. Often tricked into running up debts or signing their deeds over to these men, the traditionalists appealed to the government for help. U.S. officials turned a deaf ear to their pleas and insisted that fraudulent contracts be honored. No longer entitled after 1834 to emigrate at government expense, these landless Mississippi Choctaws either struggled to Indian territory on their own or remained in the state as an impoverished landless minority.¹⁷

The federal government made allotment a major feature of the treaties signed with the Creeks and Chickasaws in 1832. The Creek chiefs agreed to cede much of their land in Alabama and to permit some Creeks to receive the remainder in allotments. Land speculators descended on the Indians and once again defrauded many of them of their individual allotments. Evicted from their homes and farms, most Creeks still refused to go west. Tension between white intruders and foraging Indians escalated and finally erupted into violence. In 1836, the War Department responded by forcibly removing thousands of Creeks as a military measure. Although many Creeks died during their westward trek as a result of the sinking of a steamboat, disease,

hunger, and exposure, about 14,500 finally assembled in their new nation in the west.¹⁸

The Chickasaws avoided some of the suffering of the Creeks, but once again, corruption and fraud characterized their removal. Under the terms of the Treaty of Pontotoc, they ceded their eastern homeland, but the federal government delayed removal of the tribe until officials could locate a suitable tract of land in the West. In the interim, the Chickasaws received individuals plots, and the federal government opened the remaining two-thirds of the Chickasaw territory to white settlement. Speculators promptly poured into the Chickasaw country defrauding hapless Indians of their property. Finally, in desperation, the Chickasaws agreed to purchase a tract of land from the Choctaws, and in 1837-38, about four thousand Chickasaws migrated beyond the Mississippi.¹⁹

The scandal generated by allotment failed to temper Georgia's demands that the government extinguish Indian land titles within the state. The widespread suffering, however, did strengthen the Cherokees' resolve to resist removal negotiations. When Georgia courts sentenced two white missionaries to prison for their failure to take the oath of allegiance to the state, the Cherokees turned to the U.S. Supreme Court for redress of grievances. In Worcester v. Georgia, the Court enjoined Georgia from enforcing state law in the Cherokee Nation and ordered the release of the missionaries. The state refused to comply. Legal technicalities along with Jackson's disinclination to interfere precluded federal enforcement of the decision. The missionaries remained in prison, and Georgians continued to harass the Cherokees.

The Cherokee-Georgia controversy coincided with the nullification crisis that pitted the state of South Carolina against the federal government over the immediate issue of the tariff and the broader issue of states rights. In this context, Jackson's behavior seems inconsistent--bowing to states rights in Georgia while defending federal authority in South Carolina.²⁰ Many in his administration may have feared that driving Georgia into the South Carolina camp would result in dissolution of the union. Support of Georgia served to reassure southerners that the federal government was not going to interfere in their internal affairs which ranged from laws regulating native populations to the institution of slavery.

A group of Cherokees known as the Treaty Party began to consider negotiations when it became obvious that the Supreme Court decision would have little impact on the situation in the Nation. Motivated at least as much by economic and political ambitions as by concern for the Cherokee people, the Treaty Party enjoyed little popular support. The vast majority of Cherokees supported principle chief John Ross in his steadfast opposition to removal. Nevertheless, the U.S. treaty commissioner met with about one hundred Treaty Party members in December 1835, and they negotiated the Treaty of New Echota. This treaty provided for the exchange of Cherokee territory in the Southeast for a tract of land in what is today northeastern Oklahoma. No Cherokees received individual allotments; removal encompassed the entire tribe. Although fifteen thousand Cherokees, almost the total population, signed a petition protesting the treaty, the U.S. Senate ratified the document. In summer 1838, federal troops seized thousands of Cherokees and imprisoned them in stockades in preparation

for their westward trek. As the death toll mounted, the Van Buren administration, which had inherited the removal program, agreed to let the Cherokees conduct their own removal in the winter of 1838-39. Despite this "humanitarian" gesture, at least four thousand Cherokees died enroute to their new home in the West.²¹

Cherokees had fought violation of their rights in the courts; the Seminoles resisted removal militarily. The Seminoles were Creek refugees from the War of 1812 who had fought against the United States and its Creek allies. They fled to Florida where they joined with other native peoples to resist the United States. With the Seminoles were many slaves who had been seized during the war from white and Indian masters. In Florida, these bondsmen acquired considerable autonomy. Runaway slaves augmented their number, and the Indian-black alliance so feared by colonial planters at last materialized. In 1835 the United States attempted to enforce a removal treaty which a Seminole delegation had signed under duress two years earlier. The treaty provided not only for Seminole removal but for merger with the Creeks, their old enemy. Desperate Seminole warriors attacked a company of soldiers sent to round them up and the battle sparked the Second Seminole War. Skillfully employing guerilla tactics in the swamps of southern Florida and led by superb warriors such as Osceola, the Seminoles and their black allies forced the U.S. to commit a total of forty thousand men, spend \$40 million, and suffer substantial casualties over the next seven years. In attempting to defeat and remove the Indians, the government resorted to even more duplicitous means than bribing chiefs and exploiting tribal factionalism: commanders in the field with approval from Washington repeatedly

captured Seminole warriors under flags of truce. Even after the official end of the war in 1842, soldiers continued to capture and deport bands of Indians until 3,000 resided in the West and only several hundred remained in the Florida Everglades.²²

When the federal government finally managed to remove the majority of the Seminoles from Florida, a major problem developed. The government reasoned that since the Seminoles and Creeks had been one people before the War of 1812, they could share territory in the west. The Seminoles refused because they feared for the safety of their blacks. The Creeks had paid whites for the loss of slave property during the war, but the Seminoles had taken many of these slaves with them to Florida. Because they had paid for the slaves, the Creeks believed that they were entitled to them. The Seminoles disagreed, and they feared that the Creeks would seize their blacks as soon as they entered the Creek Nation. Consequently, they refused to leave the Cherokee Nation where they had disembarked. The Cherokees complained that the freedom enjoyed by the Seminole blacks had an adverse effect on their own bondsmen and attributed a slave revolt in the early 1840s in part to Seminole influence. Finally, the United States arranged for a separate Seminole Nation.²³

The southern Indians who went west took with them institutions, lifestyles, and attitudes developed in the South that they had shared with a white slaveholding society for over two hundred years. In the west they reestablished the institution of slavery. Slaves proved to be an important asset. Their labor enabled Indian slaveholders to recover quickly from economic losses caused by removal. In addition to farming, slaves operated salines, herded cattle, worked on

steamboats and docks, and performed other kinds of jobs. By 1860, over 8,000 slaves lived in the five southern nations west of the Mississippi. Slaves accounted for 14% of the total population, but only 2.3% of the citizens of these nations owned slaves. Nevertheless, the wealth which slaves produced helped their masters dominate political and economic life.²⁴

Among the Seminoles, Creeks, and Cherokees, however, many people had serious misgivings about slavery. This attitude arose less from a belief in racial equality than from resentment of the power commanded by the slaveholding elite and a desire to preserve traditional culture. Northern missionaries, particularly in the Cherokee Nation, actively encouraged abolitionism. When the Civil War broke out in the United States, the southern Indian nations faced a serious dilemma. As John Ross described the situation to the Cherokee National Council: "Our locality and situation ally us to the South, while to the North we are indebted for a defense of our rights in the past and that enlarged benevolence to which we owe our progress in civilization."²⁵ Nonslaveholding traditionalists, and even some slaveholders such as Ross, preferred neutrality which meant that existing treaties with the United States remained in effect. Most slaveholders, however, favored a Confederate alliance. The Chickasaws and Choctaws whose territory adjoined Texas negotiated Confederate treaties in July 1861. Factions of the Creeks and Seminoles followed their example, and in August Ross succumbed to pressure and signed a Confederate alliance.

The Confederacy quickly organized companies of Indian soldiers whose initial assignment was to capture Opothleyohola, a Creek traditionalist. Opothleyohola opposed the Confederate alliance and

decided to conduct a group of loyal Creeks to Kansas where they intended to take refuge behind Union lines. Many Cherokee traditionalists in service of the Confederacy refused to attack the Creek chief and instead joined his flight to Kansas where they enlisted in the Union Indian Brigade. Among the Cherokees and Creeks, the American Civil War produced their own civil wars.²⁶

Following the Civil War, the United States negotiated treaties with the five southern Indian nations which provided for the abolition of slavery and the extension of citizenship to freedmen. This latter provision was particularly important to freedmen because Indians held their land in common, and any citizen was permitted to use unoccupied land. Problems arose, however, because former Indian slaveholders were as reluctant as white slaveholders to accept their former bondsmen as equals. Many slaves had been taken to Texas during the war, and their masters simply left them there following emancipation. Unable to return to their nations in time to assert their rights, these people suffered greatly. In addition, the Choctaws delayed the grant of citizenship to freedmen for twenty years, and Chickasaw freedmen never managed to become citizens because of the legal maneuvering of their former masters. Nevertheless, many Indian freedmen did manage to acquire land which gave them the economic base denied most former slaves in the white South.²⁷

Indian slaveholders turned to a variety of economic enterprises following the Civil War. These former Confederates supported the provision in reconstruction treaties which provided for construction of railroads through Indian territory, a move opposed by traditionalists. Many former slaveholders such as Elias Cornelius

Boudinot, Cherokee delegate to the Confederate Congress, actively lobbied for railroads and other forms of economic development such as mining, ranching, logging, and oil exploration. Although traditionalists who had supported the Union in the Civil War objected strenuously to these activities which brought increasing numbers of whites into their nations, the federal government preferred "progress" and profit to loyalty.²⁸ The final result was dissolution of Indian governments and incorporation of southern Indians into the new state of Oklahoma, a state in which Indians were a minority.

The native peoples who remained in the Southeast after the removal of the large Indian nations were an even smaller minority in their states. As the essays in Walter Williams' anthology, Southeastern Indians Since the Removal Era²⁹ indicate, these Indians fell into two groups--native peoples who avoided removal and remnants of removed nations. The latter included large numbers of Choctaws, Seminoles, and Cherokees. After the 1840s, the government occasionally expressed interest in removing them, but little was done largely because they lived on land considered to be worthless. The Cherokees managed to purchase the land they occupied in the Smoky Mountains of western North Carolina, but neither the Seminoles nor Choctaws had a formally recognized tribal land base until after 1890. The Seminoles adapted to life in the inhospitable Florida everglades while the Choctaws eeked out a bare subsistence in the sand hills and swamps of central Mississippi.

The Indians who had avoided removal often lived in small isolated enclaves and had an even more precarious existence. Their obscure histories and small numbers meant they received little attention from

the government, benevolent associations, or anyone other than scheming whites. Few owned land; that is, few held deeds to land which they believed they owned. The absence of legal titles meant that unscrupulous people could force them from their homes. In 1841, for example, the captain of an "Indian patrol" established by local whites to supervise the activities of the Tunicas living in central Louisiana fenced a section of Tunica Indian land and claimed it for himself. When the Tunica Chief pulled up fence posts, the captain shot him in the head in front of most of the tribe. The white murderer never stood trial, and a Louisiana court subsequently awarded him a large portion of Tunica territory.³⁰

Some Indians managed to hold onto their land into the twentieth century, but individual whites, corporations, and even government officials constantly sought opportunities to seize native property. The loss of land by the Waccamaw of North Carolina provides a good example. In the 1920s, a surveyor employed by the state travelled through the eastern counties locating "vacant" land, this is, land to which no recorded deed existed. The Indians, of course, had been living on the land long before deeds existed, but according to white officials, they did not have legal titles. The surveyor, who also was an agent for timber companies, claimed thousands of acres of "vacant" land for the state and promptly sold it to timber companies. North Carolina received the money from the sale while the surveyor got a commission from the timber companies. Many Indians were forced off land they had occupied for years. (Finally, descendants of a Waccamaw whose land was sold in this transaction sued. In 1963, the North Carolina Supreme Court awarded them title to 126 acres.) For most

Indians who had no land or lost their land, there was no alternative to sharecropping, and many sank into debt and peonage.³¹

In addition to economic exploitation, southern Indians often suffered racial discrimination. In the Civil War, both the Mississippi Choctaws and the North Carolina Cherokees provided troops for the Confederacy. In the absurd racial lines drawn by southerners, however, the Lumbees of North Carolina were not permitted to serve as soldiers because of their designation as "free people of color." The Confederacy did conscript Lumbees to build fortifications and this precipitated a Lumbee guerilla war which lasted through Reconstruction. In the 1880s North Carolina recognized the Lumbees as Indians and set up a separate school system for them. William McKee Evans has suggested that this reclassification came about because whites preferred to view the guerrilla war as an Indian uprising rather than a black insurrection.³²

In the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, small Indian groups throughout the South confronted many of the same problems as the Lumbees. White school boards usually denied Indians admission to white schools and insisted that they attend schools established for blacks. Many Indians refused to enroll in black schools, in part out of their own racial prejudice but primarily because they feared that official designation as "black" would destroy their own ethnic identity and result in further discrimination. In addition, whites allocated far less funding for black schools than for white schools, and consequently, children who attended those schools usually received an inferior education.

Even when school boards established separate schools for Indians, the facilities were usually unsatisfactory. In 1950, an article in The American Indian gave the following description of a school provided for native children:

The present school is inadequate. It is poorly constructed, drafty, overcrowded, lacking in books and desks, and portions of it have never been ceiled on the inside. Bare studs in the room add to the general dismal appearance. There are no cloak rooms; no entry halls. Access to certain rooms are only through another. No playground or playground equipment. Three of the rooms have an ordinary tin, wood heater. The fourth is provided with no heat at all. Its construction, as well as lack of exits, create an extremely dangerous fire hazard. There is no fire fighting equipment or extinguishers. The only source of water is a hand³³ pumped well which requires priming.

Segregation extended beyond the classroom, and so did Indian resistance to being classified as black. In 1981, a Coharie man in North Carolina recounted incidents of discrimination for a reporter from the Winston-Salem Sentinel:

There was a period of time here when the Indians were just classified as blacks...I'd go down to the courthouse, for example, and the white man would come in and chase me out... And you'd pee upside the wall before you'd go to the black bathrooms. I remember one Indian veteran came home from Vietnam and he and his wife went to get a hot dog at one of these (white) restaurants and the owner tried to run him out and call a cop. The Indian fellow gathered up a crowd to stop it, but the cop shoved him out.... These things have become part of the past³⁴ now. But it's only changed during the '70s.

Even today southern Indians continue to struggle against racism and oppression. This is why it is imperative that we study southern Indians in the context of southern history. Westward expansion and

Jacksonian democracy have ended but southern Indians still exist. The problems they encounter today are legacies of racial slavery and economic exploitation which began in the colonial South and continued in the antebellum period. The first reconstruction gave slavery and exploitation new forms--sharecropping and peonage. Although the second reconstruction has brought significant change for Indians as well as other minorities in the South, its promises seem empty to those native peoples who still must contend with poverty, racism, and ethnic anonymity. Divorcing southern Indians from southern history has obscured their past and has deprived them of understanding of and sympathy for current problems. It has severed the link between past and present which denies native Southerners a place in modern America.

NOTES

1. Wilcomb E. Washburn, Red Man's Land/White Man's Law: A Study of the Past and Present Status of the American Indian (New York, 1971), 1-58.
2. The best study of native culture is Charles Hudson, Southeastern Indians (Knoxville, TN, 1976).
3. Knoxville, 1983.
4. Quoted in Gary B. Nash, Red, White, and Black: The Peoples of Early America (Englewood Cliffs, NJ, 1974), 62.
5. New York, 1981.
6. William S. Willis, Jr., "Divide and Rule: Red, White, and Black in the Old South" in Red, White, and Black: Symposium on Indians in the Old South, ed. Charles M. Hudson (Athens, GA, 1971), 99-115.
7. Boston, 1832.
8. James H. Merrell, "The Racial Education of the Catawba Indians," The Journal of Southern History 50 (1984):363-84.
9. For the development of slavery among the southern Indians, see Annie Heloise Abel, The American Indian as Slaveholder and Secessionist (Cleveland, 1915); Rudi Halliburton, Jr., Red Over Black: Black Slavery Among the Cherokee Indians (Westport, CT, 1977); Daniel F. Littlefield, Jr., Africans and Seminoles: From Removal to Emancipation (Westport, CT, 1976); Daniel F. Littlefield, Jr., Africans and Creeks: From the Colonial Period to the Civil War (Westport, CT, 1979); Theda Perdue, Slavery and the Evolution of Cherokee Society, 1540-1866 (Knoxville, 1979).

10. Daniel H. Usner, Jr. "American Indians on the Cotton Frontier: Changing Economic Relations with Citizens and Slaves in the Mississippi Territory," Journal of American History 72 (1985):297-317.
11. Arrell M. Gibson, The Chickasaws (Norman: OK, 1971), 104.
12. William G. McLoughlin, "Thomas Jefferson and the Beginning of Cherokee Nationalism, 1806-1809," William and Mary Quarterly 3d series, 32 (1975):547-80.
13. Michael D. Green, The Politics of Indian Removal: Creek Government and Society in Crisis (Lincoln, NE, 1982), 69-97.
14. For the development of U.S. Indian policy see Francis Paul Prucha, American Indian Policy in the Formative Years: The Indian Trade and Intercourse Acts, 1790-1834 (Cambridge, MA, 1962). For the later period see Ronald N. Satz, American Indian Policy in the Jacksonian Era (Lincoln, 1976).
15. Arthur H. DeRosier, Jr., The Removal of the Choctaw Indians (Knoxville, 1970). The details of the removal of southern Indians can be found in Grant Foreman, Indian Removal: The Emigration of the Five Civilized Tribes of Indians (Norman, 1932).
16. Norman, 1961.
17. John H. Peterson, Jr., "Three Efforts at Development among the Choctaws of Mississippi" in Southeastern Indians Since the Removal Era (Athens, GA, 1979), 142-53.
18. Green, 127-86.
19. Gibson, 175-215.
20. Michael Paul Rogin attempts to explain this inconsistency in Fathers and Children: Andrew Jackson and the Subjugation of the American Indian (New York, 1975).

21. For Cherokee removal, see Thurman Wilkins, Cherokee Tragedy: The Story of the Ridge Family and the Decimation of a People (New York, 1970); Gary E. Moulton, John Ross, Cherokee Chief (Athens, 1978); Theda Perdue, ed., Cherokee Editor: The Writings of Elias Boudinot (Knoxville, 1983); and Grace Steele Woodward, The Cherokees (Norman, 1963), 182-218.
22. Edwin C. McReynolds, The Seminoles (Norman, 1957), 137-242; Harry A. Kersey, Jr., "Those Left Behind: The Seminole Indians of Florida" in Williams, Southeastern Indians, 174-90.
23. McReynolds, 243-63.
24. Michael F. Doran, "Negro Slaves of the Five Civilized Tribes," Annals of the Association of American Geographers 68 (1978):335-50.
25. Gary E. Moulton, ed., The Papers of John Ross 2 Vols. (Norman, 1985), 2:450.
26. Angie Debo, The Road to Disappearance: A History of the Creek Indians (Norman, 1941), 142-76.
27. M. Thomas Bailey, Reconstruction in Indian Territory: A Story of Avarice, Discrimination, and Opportunism (Port Washington, NY, 1972); Daniel F. Littlefield, Jr., The Cherokee Freedmen: From Emancipation to American Citizenship (Westport, CT, 1978); Daniel F. Littlefield, Jr., The Chickasaw Freedmen: A People Without a Country (Westport, CT, 1980).
28. H. Craig Miner, The Corporation and the Indian: Tribal Sovereignty and Industrial Civilization in Indian Territory, 1867-1907 (Columbia, MO, 1976); Theda Perdue, Nations Remembered: An Oral History of the Five Civilized Tribes (Westport, CT, 1980).
29. Athens, GA, 1979.

30. Ernest C. Downs, "The Struggle of the Louisiana Tunica Indians for Recognition" in Williams, Southeastern Indians, 72-89.
31. The Winston-Salem Sentinel, 29 April 1981.
32. William McKee Evans, "The North Carolina Lumbees: From Assimilation to Revitalization" in Williams, Southeastern Indians, 49-71; William McKee Evans, To Die Game: The Story of the Lowry Band, Indian Guerillas of Reconstruction (Baton Rouge: LA, 1971).
33. James Evan Alexander, "The Waccamaw Indians," reprinted in The State 17 (1950):3-4, 17-18.
34. 30 April 1981.

714-22-04

Indians and The American Survey:
Thoughts on Supplementary Readings

By James H. Merrell
Vassar College

Finding supplementary readings on Indian history is easy: there is a vast amount of material on the subject available. The hard part is wading through the literature to identify precious scholarly nuggets that can enrich a student's understanding of the native American past, and then fitting these gems into an already-crowded syllabus. This essay and the accompanying list of suggestions are designed to make the prospecting less frustrating and the task of incorporating Indians into surveys of American history less formidable.

A glance at the list of titles will reveal that it is largely confined to Indians east of the Mississippi River prior to their removal during the Jacksonian era. I have adopted this approach because in my experience these are the Indians students know the least, and dispelling ignorance of the first three centuries of contact between Old World and New, when patterns of cultural interaction were set, will build a foundation upon which understanding of other Indians and more recent times can rest.

Perhaps the most effective way to introduce history students to native Americans is face to face, through original source materials. An eyewitness account breathes life into Indians of the past, presenting them with an immediacy that no historian can match. The

range of topics covered in a single primary source can be extraordinary, including everything from trade and diplomacy to sex and humor (Indians frequently thought European ways uproariously funny), from religious rituals and hunting secrets to old age and youth. It is well worth exposing a class to contemporary accounts as well as (or instead of) secondary works, to assign them Thomas Hariot on Roanoke rather than David Quinn, William Wood on early New England rather than Neal Salisbury, John Eliot on Puritan missionaries rather than Francis Jennings, Edmond Atkin on the southern nations rather than Charles Hudson--even John Lawson on Carolina Indians rather than James Merrell!

This is not to belittle the work of scholars engaged in improving our understanding of Indian history; indeed, for all of the benefits that work in primary materials can bestow, secondary sources offer the distance and the perspective that only sensitive scholarship can provide. Overwhelmed by the range of choices, people--especially people teaching American history survey courses!--often ask what is the best single item on Eastern Indians prior to Removal. There is a short list of possibilities, suitable not only in terms of quality but also length and price, those two essential variables in planning any syllabus. Certainly James Axtell's collection of essays, The European and the Indian, must be included on this list, not only for the range of topics it covers but for the way it covers them--there is a clarity of thought and expression here that appeals to students. Part I of Francis Jennings's The Invasion of America, which deals with the Northeast in the seventeenth century, is another obvious choice. The book's strident tone has drawn critical fire, but it is for that very

reason an excellent means of forcing students to wrestle with their biases--and with Jennings's--while introducing them to the subject. Love it or hate it, they will not soon forget it. For the South, J. Leitch Wright has recently written a stimulating general account of Indians from first contact to Removal, an account that, while less strident than Jennings's, is no less thoroughly researched, and gets much the same point across.

Valuable as they are, these three general selections favor breadth over depth, with some loss of historical concreteness in the bargain. A book that solves this problem is Anthony Wallace's Death and Rebirth of the Seneca. After an excellent first section on Iroquois society and culture, psyche and ceremony, Wallace follows Seneca fortunes to their nadir in the aftermath of the American Revolution and leads us on to their spiritual and cultural revival after 1800 in the religion of Handsome Lake. The work combines breadth of focus with depth of analysis, a sparkling style with a gift for storytelling, into a coherent whole of unsurpassed quality. For the purposes of a survey course, Wallace's work is best thought of as a community study along the lines of some of the New England town studies many classes already use, or of recent work on colonial Virginia. Seen in these terms, connections can be drawn between various communities in America, communities making their way across the generations, reordering their lives as circumstances dictated.

For every person inquiring about one book to assign, another asks for one article. Perhaps the best is the classic study by Nancy Lurie of the Virginian Indians' "cultural adjustment" to the English during the seventeenth century. Lurie does a superb job of illustrating how

natives perceived the English at first contact, and why relations disintegrated so rapidly after 1607. Broader in geographic and chronological scope is Ted Brasser's "The Algonkians: People of the First Frontier," a fine account of the coastal tribes from precontact times to the present. And at the risk of being thought immodest, I will add to this short list my article on the Catawba Indians' "New World." I do so not because Catawbas are the single most important native group in Eastern North America, but rather because that essay tries to draw explicit parallels between the Catawba experience and that of their white and black neighbors, parallels that can provide a useful starting point for class discussion.

A better approach than slipping a book or an article into the syllabus and letting it go at that would be to offer readings on various important topics. The first point to get across is some sense of the complex and dynamic character of the native societies colonists met, to dispel the deeply-rooted notion that natives were simple savages (noble or otherwise) who lived in a static world until Europeans arrived to get the historical ball rolling. Any number of readings can show the cultural development and sophistication of aboriginal America. Part I of Wallace's Seneca book, the first chapter of Neal Salisbury's work on New England, sections of Charles Hudson's volume on Southern Indians--all can serve to open students' eyes. An especially useful tool is an article by Lynn Ceci on ethnoastronomy, in which the author demonstrates how native cultivators, using the stars, measured seasonal changes in order to schedule their planting in a marginal agricultural climate.

If it is important to help students sketch the dimensions of the precontact world, it is no less important for them to recognize that during the early years of contact each side formed impressions of the other that would help to shape later events. The literature on English views of Indians is voluminous. One of the first (and still one of the best) studies in this genre was written by Roy Harvey Pearce more than three decades ago. Since then many people have added to the list: Karen Kupperman's book on the years 1580-1640, Alden Vaughan's recent essay on changing views of Indian color, and Gary Nash's seminal work on southern colonial attitudes are particularly noteworthy. These works can be especially instructive when placed alongside Winthrop Jordan's study of English perceptions of Africans or Nicholas Canny's article on how English attitudes toward the Irish were transported across the ocean and transposed to fit Indians.

Indian views of the European intruder are more difficult to discern, but there are several tantalizing glimpses from the other side of the cultural divide. Cornelius Jaenen on the Canadian Indians' attitude toward the French, John Ewers's essay tracing native views up to 1850, James Ronda's more tightly focused study of the Indian critique of Christianity in the seventeenth century, and the Lurie article already mentioned can serve to counterbalance the massive scholarship on Europeans and give students a means of comparing the two.

Once we leave attitudes behind, dealing with Indian-European relations in the seventeenth century becomes much more complicated. During this first century of sustained interaction the two sides sought some common ground, some means of crossing that cultural divide

in order to get along. The result was considerable confusion, confusion compounded by the fact that patterns of contact were taking shape in four different, albeit overlapping, arenas: the Chesapeake, New England, the Middle Colonies, and the Carolinas. How to convey all of this to students without getting lost, and losing them in the process? The answer lies in one of two comparative approaches, one regional and the other topical.

Consider the regional first. Begin by asking why, in the Chesapeake, Maryland's relations with Indians followed a path so divergent from Virginia's experience, the one marked by two bloody wars, the other (generally) by peace. To help answer that question, and to ensure that the differing character of the Indian societies involved is one variable in the equation, assign readings on Virginia (Lurie, an article by Frederick Fausz, a chapter in Wright and Wesley Frank Craven's book) and others on Maryland, such as my work on the Piscataways or Frank Porter's on the Nanticokes. Then let the class try to come up with an explanation that none of these readings alone can offer. The same sort of comparative approach can be adopted to cross regional as well as provincial lines. By itself, Wright's book encourages comparison among the southern colonies. By combining readings, the class can head north from the Chesapeake as well. How and why did New England differ from Virginia, or either from New York? The answers may be found in the works of Salisbury, Jennings, and Vaughan, and of Allen Trelease on New York.

Answering any of these questions demands a lot of reading. To avoid that problem it may be necessary to narrow the focus. Set Salisbury's chapter on Squanto alongside Fausz's on Opechcancanough,

using individual lives to suggest regional differences. Compare the work that Fausz has done on the arms race in early Virginia with Patrick Malone's study of the changing military technology in New England. Assign William Simmons, Salisbury, Jennings, or a section of Vaughan on New England missionaries, supplementing it with a chapter in Axtell on "The Invasion Within," or Daniel Richter on Jesuits among the Iroquois, or the chapter in Wright on southern efforts (or lack of efforts) to convert Indians. Any of these combinations helps unlock the similarities and differences in the seventeenth-century Indian experience. They have the added advantage of forcing students to make the comparison themselves, thereby transforming them from passive sponges soaking up information to active interpreters of the past--in other words, into historians.

The second mode of imposing some coherence on that chaotic seventeenth century engages students by asking for comparisons not between one region and another but between Indian and European. The purpose here should be to bring the class to analyze the two societies as just that--two societies, each with its own means of ordering human existence, rather than higher and lower, better and worse, civilized and savage. Any number of topics suggest themselves. You could, for example, introduce students to the demography of colonial America by sending them off to read about mortality rates and their consequences in Indian America, in early Virginia, and in Puritan New England, setting the work of Alfred Crosby, Sherburne Cook, and Calvin Martin against their Anglo-American counterparts. Another new avenue of inquiry is the history of the environment, which William Cronon's study of the changing landscape of colonial New England handles

superbly, embracing natives and newcomers in a single, finely-crafted framework. Or students might find an investigation of growing up in Anglo-America and native America especially relevant to their own experience. Axtell's documentary collection, when read in conjunction with sections of John Demos's book examining childhood in Plymouth colony, should open fruitful topics that can be pursued in class or in a paper. Axtell's collection also has much to say about women in native society, and his documents, when studied in light of the work on colonial women, offer rich possibilities for comparison. Finally, the central role of religion in the colonial American story makes a cross-cultural comparison of religious beliefs and practices an obvious possibility. Reading the first section of Wallace on the Seneca, or Salisbury and Jennings on New England, or Hudson and Wright on the Southeast will provide an appreciation of the complexity of Indian religions while also giving students a better perspective on the faith of the colonists.

If the problem with constructing assignments on Indians in the seventeenth century is too much information, the problem with the eighteenth century is too little. There are, however, several ways to prevent the Indians' utter disappearance from the American scene after 1700. One of the best starting points is Richard Johnson's "The Search for a Usable Indian," which peeks behind the facade erected by Indian-hating rhetoric in New England after King Philip's War to demonstrate that New Englanders eagerly continued to seek native allies. Here students can discern the outlines of a patron-client relationship, with conquered native groups learning to live as internal colonies by meeting the needs--in this case, the military

needs--of their conquerors. For all his insights into the shadowy process of accommodation, Johnson is better on English actions than Indian. To flesh out the story, and to acquire some sense of the changes natives had to make in their patterns of conflict, supplement Johnson with Daniel Richter's essay on the cultural role of warfare among the Iroquois during this period.

Transformations in forms of conflict among Indians who survived the seventeenth century were paralleled by equally sweeping, and no less creative, adaptations in other areas of native life. An exciting way to explore these is by journeying with Daniel Vickers and James Ronda to two islands off the coast of New England where remnant Indian populations were working out ways of living as conquered people. Ronda, who reconstructs the religious life of the Christian Indians on Martha's Vineyard, tells an extraordinary story of people embracing an alien system of belief and making it their own, developing a faith that used the new ways to shore up the old communal existence. Vickers, examining the evolution of the whaling industry on nearby Nantucket, offers a very different sort of tale, a bleak account of the slow process whereby colonists wore away Indian economic independence until the native population was little more than a pool of servile labor for the whalers. Each article is illuminating by itself; when read together, they are a powerful tool for suggesting how Indians managed to survive behind the frontier by constructing a warm and rich spiritual life as a refuge from the cold, hard facts of conquest and dependence. (The similarities with the Afro-American experience are suggestive.)

Another means of including the Indian experience in the larger story of the late colonial period is to follow the native response to the Great Awakening. The literature on Indians and the Awakening comes largely from William Simmons, who has examined events in native New England. Simmons and his wife have also edited the journal of Joseph Fish, a would-be missionary among a Baptist Indian community during the 1760s. Their work offers obvious points of comparison with other recent studies of the Awakening among colonists. Did Indians embrace the New Light faith for the same reasons as Anglo-Americans did? If so, what does this suggest about the natives' place in colonial society? If not, how--and why--did they differ?

The literature on Indians in the American Revolution is at once richer and poorer than that for the rest of the eighteenth century. Wallace's book has a brief section on the Iroquois, Francis Jennings has written a useful and unconventional article, but there remains a real need for studies on Indians during this period suitable for adoption in a survey course.

Fortunately, the picture for the decades following the Revolution is much brighter. The challenge becomes not finding supplemental readings in but combining the excellent work with a survey of the early national period. One useful approach is to follow William McLoughlin, who argues that natives should be considered in the larger context of the new nation's effort to create an identity for itself, to answer Crèvecoeur's famous question: "what, then, is the American, this new man?" Did Indians, could Indians, belong, as Crèvecoeur hoped they might?

It is tempting to begin our inquiries with the fundamental changes in attitude among white Americans in this age. The Pearce volume and the Vaughan article mentioned earlier, along with Bernard Sheehan's Seeds of Extinction, suggest how Americans slowly came to exclude Indians even from the prospect of incorporation into the American mainstream. Fascinating as these studies are, they implicitly place natives in the background. A better strategy would be to have the class investigate how native peoples responded to, and in turn helped to shape, those white attitudes and policies. To map the spectrum of native response, assign one of R. David Edmund's brief biographies of Tecumseh or the Shawnee Prophet, in conjunction with the work James and Jeanne Ronda have done on the Stockbridge Indian Hendrick Aupaumut. The two Shawnee leaders carved out similar stances in opposition to the United States; Aupaumut, on the other hand, preached peace and acculturation to any Indian groups that would listen. A similar perspective can be gained by reading Wallace on Handsome Lake or Kim McQuaid on William Apes, the Pequot reformer who skillfully resisted efforts to deprive New England Indians of their few remaining rights. Switching the combination--placing Handsome Lake with the Shawnee Prophet and Aupaumut with Apes--also raises intriguing questions about why Indian revitalization movements took on such a different character or why Apes and Aupaumut, similar in many ways, adopted such contrasting approaches. Using biography to illuminate an era or a problem offers students something concrete to focus on as they grapple with more abstract notions like acculturation and revitalization. Through individual lives a class can grasp the

possibilities--and the limits of possibility--available to Indians confronted with an energetic, expansionist nation.

Careful attention to a specific people rather than one person can also capture the student's imagination. For this, the Cherokees offer the richest source for a section devoted to Indians in the new nation, in part because their process of nation-building during these years paralleled that of the United States, offering a ready means of integrating them into the course. William McLoughlin's collection of essays, The Cherokee Ghost Dance, is perhaps the best place to look. Begin with "Cherokee Anomie," as McLoughlin plumbs the depths to which Cherokees had sunk after the chaos of the Revolution. From there the student can follow McLoughlin as he in turn follows the Cherokees in their extraordinary political, social, and religious revival. Rich in detail, sensitive to the subtleties of this phenomenon, McLoughlin's articles paint a moving portrait of a people creating a coherent nation out of social disorder and political fragmentation. To connect his story more explicitly with the development of the new nation, consider including Mary Young's thought-provoking piece, which argues that the revitalized Cherokee Nation was "A Mirror of the Republic," and that in this achievement lay the seeds of ruin.

That ruin--Indian Removal--has received a great deal of attention, and the collection of original sources by Louis Filler and Allen Guttman effectively leads the reader into the topic. To further stimulate discussion, split the class into two groups to debate the Removal question. Even after setting the debate off on its merry way, the nagging problem of how it all fits still remains. In my own course I place Removal into the broader context set by David

Rothman's Discovery of the Asylum, arguing that the same intellectual and social forces placing criminals, paupers, and the insane out of sight during these years also had a hand in the removal of Indians. In each case, the stated aim was removal in order to reform; in each case, the results were quite otherwise. Drawing these connections challenges students to think, to try and fit discrete pieces of the puzzle--including Indians--into a single interpretation of antebellum America.

After Removal the focus of Indian-white relations naturally shifts westward. This is entirely appropriate, as long as it does not leave the student with the impression that the history of Eastern Indians ends in 1840. To dispel their illusions, at least three subjects demand attention. Perhaps the most important is simply that Eastern Indians have not vanished, which leads inevitably to the second lesson, a continuation of questions raised in the colonial period, of how Indians have managed to survive behind the frontier. This, in turn, should bring students to ask what it is that makes an Eastern Indian today--often without an aboriginal culture or language, occasionally without even a distinctive appearance--still an Indian. A variety of sources listed below deals with these issues. Among the best are the studies by Edmund Wilson on the Iroquois and Karen Blu on the Lumbee. Students would also enjoy Theodore Kazimiroff's The Last Algonquin, not only because it is the account of a fascinating life but also because it raises important questions about the nature of historical evidence.

The titles discussed here and included in the list that follows barely scratch the surface of the supplemental sources on Eastern

Indians, and they contain nothing at all on natives west of the Mississippi River. At the same time, however, even the material offered here may seem overwhelming to someone faced with the prospect of constructing a survey course syllabus, a syllabus with little space to spare. It is best to consider this a menu, from which the instructor can choose what suits his or her taste. Like any menu, it does not offer everything, and those whose taste differ (or who have an unusually large appetite) should consult the bibliographies compiled by Francis Paul Prucha or those published by the Newberry Library to hunt further for dishes that look appealing.

The aim is not to blanket the survey course syllabus with a flurry of articles and books on Indians, but rather, in any number of possible ways, to rescue natives from historical obscurity and weave them into the fabric of our past. In so doing students will gain a better appreciation not only of the native American experience but of the American experience, which after all is the point of the enterprise in which we are engaged.

Supplementary Reading List: Some Suggestions for Eastern Indians

Bibliographies

- Jennings, Francis, gen. ed. The Newberry Library Center for the History of the American Indian Bibliographical Series (Chicago, 1976-).
- Prucha, Francis P., ed. A Bibliographical Guide to the History of Indian-White Relations in the United States (Chicago, 1977)
- _____, ed. Indian-White Relations in the United States: A Bibliography of Works Published, 1975-1980 (Lincoln, NE, 1982).

Anthologies & Collections

- Axtell, James. The European and the Indian: Essays in the Ethnohistory of Colonial North America (New York, 1981).
- _____, ed. The Indian Peoples of Eastern North America: A Documentary History of the Sexes (New York, 1981).
- Filler, Louis, and Allen Guttman, eds. The Removal of the Cherokee Nation: Manifest Destiny or National Dishonor? (Boston, 1962).
- McLoughlin, William. The Cherokee Ghost Dance: Essays on the Southeastern Indians, 1789-1961 (Macon, GA, 1984).
- Vaughan, Alden T., and Edward W. Clark, eds. Puritans Among the Indians: Accounts of Captivity and Redemption, 1676-1724 (Cambridge, MA, 1981).
- Williams, Walter, ed. The Southeastern Indians Since the Removal Era (Athens, GA, 1979).

Primary Sources

- Atkin, Edmond, Appalachian Indian Frontier: The Edmond Atkin Report and Plan of 1755. Ed. Wilbur R. Jacobs (Columbia, SC, 1954).
- Bartram, William. Travels (Philadelphia, 1791).
- Bowden, Henry W., and James P. Ronda, eds. John Eliot's Indian Dialogues: A Study in Cultural Interaction (Westport, CT, 1980).
- Colden, Cadwallader. The History of the Five Indian Nations Depending on the Province of New York in America (New York, 1727).
- Harriot, Thomas. A Brief and True Report of the New Found Land of Virginia. The Complete Theodor De Bry Edition (London, 1900).
- Lawson, John. A New Voyage to Carolina. Ed. Hugh T. Lefler (London, 1709).
- Patterson, J. B. The Life of Black Hawk, Narrated by Himself (Rock Island, IL, 1833).
- Perdue, Theda, ed. Cherokee Editor: The Writings of Elias Boudinot (Knoxville, TN, 1983).
- Prucha, Francis P., ed. Cherokee Removal: the "William Penn" Essays and Other Writings by Jeremiah Evarts (Knoxville, 1981).

- Simmons, William S., and Cheryl L. Simmons, eds. Old Light on Separate Ways: The Narragansett Diary of Joseph Fish, 1765-76 (Hanover, NH, 1982).
- Williams, Roger. A Key into the Language of America.... Ed. John T. Hinz and Evelyn J. Hinz (Detroit, 1973).
- Wood, William. New Englands Prospect. Ed. Alden T. Vaughan and Winfred E. Bernard (Amherst, MA, 1977).

A Few General Selections

- Brasser, T. J. C. "Coastal Algonkians: The People of the First Frontier." In Eleanor Leacock and Nancy Lurie, eds. North American Indians in Historical Perspective, (New York, 1971), 64-91.
- Jennings, Francis. The Invasion of America: Indians, Colonialism, and the Cant of Conquest (Chapel Hill, NC, 1975).
- Lurie, Nancy Oestreich. "Indian Cultural Adjustment to European Civilization." In James M. Smith, ed. Seventeenth-Century America: Essays in Colonial History (Chapel Hill, 1959), 33-60.
- Merrell, James H. "The Indians' New World: The Catawba Experience." Wm. & Mary Qtrly., 3d Ser. 41 (1984), 537-65.
- Wallace, A. F. C. The Death and Rebirth of the Seneca (New York, 1970).
- Wright, J. Leitch, Jr. The Only Land They Knew: The Tragic Story of the American Indian in the Old South (New York, 1981).

Precontact to 1700

- Canny, Nicholas. "The Ideology of Colonization: From Ireland to America." Wm. and Mary Qtrly., 3d Ser. 30 (1973), 575-95.
- Ceci, Lynn. "Watchers of the Pleiades: Ethnohistory Among Native Cultivators in Northeastern North America." Ethnohistory 25 (1978), 301-17.
- Cook, Sherburne F. "The Significance of Disease in the Extinction of the New England Indians." Human Biology 45 (1973), 485-508.
- Craven, Wesley Frank. White, Red, and Black: The Seventeenth-Century Virginian (Charlottesville, VA, 1971).
- Cronon, William. Changes in the Land: Indians, Colonists, and the Ecology of New England (New York, 1983).
- Crosby, Alfred W., Jr. The Columbian Exchange: Biological and Cultural Consequences of 1492 (Westport, CT, 1972).
- _____. "Virgin Soil Epidemics as a Factor in the Aboriginal Depopulation of America." Wm. and Mary Qtrly. 3d Ser. 33 (1976), 289-99.
- Ewers, John C. "Indian Views of the White Man Prior to 1850." In Daniel Tyler, ed. Red Men and Hat Wearers: Viewpoints in Indian History (Boulder, CO., 1976).
- Fausz, J. Frederick. "Fighting 'Fire' with Firearms: The Anglo-Powhatan Arms Race in Early Virginia." Am. Indian Culture and Research Jnl. 3 (1979), 33-50.
- G. Sweet and Gary B. Nash, eds. Struggle and Survival in Colonial America (Berkeley, CA, 1981) 21-37.

- Hudson, Charles M. The Southeastern Indians (Knoxville, 1976).
- Jaenen, Cornelius J. "American Views of French Culture in the Seventeenth Century." Can. Hist. Rev. 55 (1974), 261-91.
- Jennings, Francis, "Goals and Functions of Puritan Missions to the Indians," Ethnohistory 18 (1971), 197-212.
- Kuppermann, Karen. Settling with the Indians: The Meeting of English and Indian Cultures in America, 1580-1640 (Totowa, NJ, 1980).
- Malone, Patrick M. "Changing Military Technology Among the Indians of Southern New England, 1600-1677." Am. Qtrly. 25 (1973), 48-63.
- Martin, Calvin. "The European Impact on the Culture of a Northeastern Algonquian Tribe: An Ecological Interpretation." Wm. and Mary Qtrly., 3d Ser. 31 (1974), 1-26.
- _____. Keepers of the Game: Indian-Animal Relationships and the Fur Trade (Berkeley, 1978).
- Merrell James H. "Cultural Continuity Among the Piscataway Indians of Colonial Maryland." Wm. and Mary Qtrly. 3d Ser., 36 (1979), 548-70.
- Nash, Gary B. "The Image of the Indian in the Southern Colonial Mind." Wm. and Mary Qtrly., 3d Ser., 29 (1972), 197-230.
- Pearce, Roy Harvey. The Savages of America: A Study of the Indian and the Idea of Civilization (Baltimore, 1953).
- Porter, Frank W., III. "A Century of Accommodation: The Nanticoke Indians in Colonial Maryland." Maryland Hist. Mag. 74 (1979), 175-97.
- Richter, Daniel K. "Iroquois vs. Iroquois: Jesuit Missions and Christianity in Village Politics, 1642-1686." Ethnohistory 32 (1985), 1-16.
- Ronda, James. "We are Well as We Are": An Indian Critique of Seventeenth-Century Missions." Wm. and Mary Qtrly. 3d Ser. 34 (1977), 66-82.
- Russell, Howard S. Indian New England Before the Mayflower (Hanover, NH, 1980).
- Salisbury, Neal. Manitou and Providence: Indians, Europeans, and the Making of New England, 1500-1643 (New York, 1982).
- _____. "Red Puritans: The 'Praying Indians' of Massachusetts Bay and John Eliot." Wm. and Mary Qtrly. 3d Ser., 31 (1974), 27-54.
- _____. "Squanto: Last of the Patuxets." In Sweet and Nash, eds. Struggle and Survival in Colonial America, (Berkeley, 1981), 228-246.
- Sauer, Carl Ortwin. Sixteenth Century North America: The Land and People as Seen by Europeans (Berkeley, 1971).
- Simmons, William S. "Conversion from Indian to Puritan" New Eng. Qtrly., 52 (1979), 197-218.
- Trelease, Allen. Indian Affairs in Colonial New York: The Seventeenth Century (Ithaca, NY, 1960).
- Vaughan, Alden T. New England Frontier: Puritans and Indians, 1620-1675 (Boston, 1965, revised edn., 1979).
- _____. "From White Man to Redskin: Changing Anglo-American Perceptions of the American Indian." Am. Hist. Rev. 87 (1982), 917-53.

1700 to 1790

- Graymont Barbara. The Iroquois in the American Revolution (Syracuse, NY 1972).
- Jennings, Francis. "The Indians' Revolution." In Alfred Young, ed. The American Revolution: Explorations in the History of American Radicalism, (DeKalb, IL, 1976), 319-48.
- Johnson, Richard R. "The Search for a Usable Indian: An Aspect of the Defense of Colonial New England." Jnl. Am. Hist. 64 (1977), 623-51.
- O'Donnell, James H. The Southern Indians in the American Revolution (Knoxville, 1973).
- Richter, Daniel K. "War and Culture: The Iroquois Experience." Wm. and Mary Qtrly. 3d Ser., 40 (1983), 528-559.
- Ronda, James P. "Generations of Faith: The Christian Indians of Martha's Vineyard." Wm. and Mary Qtrly. 3d Ser., 38 (1981), 369-94.
- Simmons, William S. "Red Yankees: Narragansett Conversion in the Great Awakening." Am. Ethnologist 10 (1983), 253-71.
- Vickers, Daniel. "The First Whalemens of Nantucket." Wm. and Mary Qtrly. 40 (1983), 560-583.

1790 to 1840

- Berkhofer, Robert F., Jr. "Model Zions for the American Indian." Am. Qtrly. 15 (1963), 176-190.
- Bolt, Christine. "The Anti-Slavery Origins of Concern for the American Indians." In Bolt et al., eds. Anti-Slavery, Religion, and Reform: Essays in Memory of Roger Anstey.
- Debo, Angie. The Rise and Fall of the Choctaw Republic (Norman, OK, 1934).
- DeRosier, Arthur H., Jr. "Myths and Realities in Indian Westward Removal: The Choctaw Example." In Charles Hudson, ed. Four Centuries of Southern Indians.
- _____. Removal of the Choctaw Indians (Knoxville, 1970).
- Edmunds, R. David. The Shawnee Prophet (Lincoln, NE, 1983).
- _____. Tecumseh and the Quest for Indian Leadership (Boston, 1984).
- Green, Michael D. The Politics of Indian Removal: Creek Government and Society in Crisis (Lincoln, 1982).
- Kerber, Linda K. "The Abolitionist Perception of the Indian." Jnl. Am. Hist. 62 (1975), 271-95.
- McLoughlin, William. "Red Indians, Black Slavery, White Racism: America's Slaveholding Indians." Am. Qtrly. 26 (1974), 367-85.
- McQuaid, Kim. "William Apes, Pequot: An Indian Reformer in the Jacksonian Era." New Eng. Qtrly. 50 (1977), 605-25.
- Merrell, James H. "The Racial Education of the Catawba Indians." Jnl. of Southern Hist. 50 (1984), 363-384.
- Perdue, Theda. Slavery and the Evolution of Cherokee Society (Knoxville, 1979).
- Ronda, James, and Jeanne Ronda. "'As They Were Faithful': Chief Hendrick Aupaumut and the Struggle for Stockbridge Survival." Am. Ind. Culture and Res. Jnl 3 (1979), 43-55.
- Satz, Ronald. American Indian Policy in the Jacksonian Era (Lincoln, 1975).

- Sheehan, Bernard. Seeds of Extinction: Jeffersonian Phlanthropy and the American Indian (Chapel Hill, 1973).
- Willis, William. "Divide and Rule: Red, White, and Black in the Southeast" Jnl. of Negro History 48 (1963), 157-76.
- Young, Mary. "The Cherokee Nation: Mirror of the Republic." Am. Qtrly. 33 (1981), 502-24.
- _____. "Indian Removal and Land Allotment: The Civilized Tribes and Jacksonian Justice." Am. Hist. Rev. 64 (1958), 31-45.
- Washburn, Wilcomb. "Indian Removal Policy: Administrative, Historical, and Moral Criteria for Judging Its Success or Failure." Ethnohistory 12 (1965), 274-278.

1840 to Present

- Blu, Karen I. The Lumbee Problem: The Making of an American Indian People (Cambridge, MA, 1980).
- Boissevain, Ethel. "Narragansett Survival: A Study of Group Persistence through Adapted Traits." Ethnohistory 6 (1959), 347-62.
- Brodeur, Paul. Restitution: The Land Claims of the Mashpee, Passamaquoddy, and Penobscot Indians of New England (Hanover, NH, 1985).
- Finger, John. The Eastern Band of Cherokees, 1819-1900 (Knoxville, 1984).
- Hauptman, Laurence. The Iroquois and the New Deal (Syracuse, 1981).
- Hicks, George, and David Kertzer. "Making a Middle Way: Problems of Monhegan identity." So.wn. Jnl. of Anthro. 28 (1972), 1-24.
- Hudson, Charles M. The Catawba Nation (Athens, GA, 1970).
- Kazimiroff, Theodore K. The Last Algonquin (New York, 1983).
- Mochon, Marion. "Stockbridge-Munsee Cultural Adaptations: 'Assimilated Indians.'" Proc. Am. Phil. Soc. 112 (1968), 182-219.
- Porter, Frank W. III. "Strategies for Survival: The Nanticokes in a Hostile World." Ethnohistory 26 (1979), 325-46.
- Wilson, Edmund. Apologies to the Iroquois (New York 1960).

Audio-Visual Workshop: Supplemental Bibliography

Indian Impact Conference

W. R. Swagerty, University of Idaho

Integration of audio-visual materials on American Indians into college-level curriculum in American history has been facilitated in recent years by the widespread availability of commercial and non-profit materials. Most of the visual materials recommended below can be used or converted into a variety of formats, depending on preference and available technology. Some items have been commercially prepared in the form of overhead transparencies or thirty-five millimeter slides; other materials, such as wall maps, are ready for use. Most visuals in printed format require transference into overhead, slide or photocopy format. These items are generally copy protected under United States Copyright Law and cannot be produced in duplicates or for distribution without permission of the publisher and/or holder of the copyright. It is highly recommended that all instructors thoroughly investigate copyright restrictions before distributing materials in duplicate. Where commercially-produced visuals are available, it is wise to purchase these directly from the supplier. Where visuals must be converted into usable format from books, prints, etcetera, restrictions should be investigated prior to photographic or other duplication.

The following list corresponds to items mentioned in the workshop for possible adoption in the classroom. Items indicated with an asterisk

Were added after the Washington, D.C. conference.

OVERHEADS ACCOMPANYING MAJOR SURVEY TEXTS

Mary Beth Norton, et al., A People and A Nation (Boston: Houghton-Mifflin, 1982; 2nd ed. 1985)

John A. Garraty, The American Nation; A History of the United States (New York: Harper, 5th ed., 1983)

Robert A. Divine, et al., America Past and Present (Glenview: Scott Foresman and Company, 1984)

*Gary B. Nash, et al., The American People: Creating a Nation and a Society (New York: Harper and Row, 1986)

VISUALS IN MAJOR TEXTS SURVEYING INDIAN HISTORY AND CULTURE

Arrell M. Gibson, The American Indian: Prehistory to the Present (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1980)

Gary B. Nash, Red, White and Black: The Peoples of Early America (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 2nd ed., 1982)

Alice B. Kehoe, North American Indians: A Comprehensive Account (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall, 1981)

Harold E. Driver, Indians of North America (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2nd ed., revised, 1969) [especially useful for the maps included as an appendix]

EXAMPLES OF GRAPHS, CHARTS, TABLES FOR OVERHEADS

Sherburne F. Cook and Woodrow Borah, Essays in Population History: Mexico and the Caribbean, Volume One (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1971) [population decline axis graphs]

Charles Gibson, The Aztecs Under Spanish Rule: A History of the Indians of the Valley of Mexico, 1519-1810 (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1964) [especially useful for illustrating the institution of the *encomienda*]

Henry F. Dobyns, Their Number Become Thinned; Native American Population Dynamics in Eastern North America (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1983) [contains lists of major epidemics in North America]

BASE MAPS OF THE U.S., MEXICO AND NORTH AMERICA

Erwin Raisz Company, 130 Charles St., Boston, MA 02114

SPECIAL MAPS ON INDIAN CULTURE AND HISTORY

National Geographic Society, P.O. Box 2806, Washington, D.C. 20013.
"Indians of North America" is especially useful.

United States Department of the Interior, Bureau of Indian Affairs
(available through G.P.O., Washington D.C. 20402) Example:
"Indian Land Areas"

United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service
"Handbook Series" on National Historic Sites, Monuments, Parks.
Example, Alvin M. Josephy, Jr., (primary author), Nez Perce
Country, Handbook 121 (Washington: U.S. Department of the
Interior, 1983).

*Southwest Museum, Highland Park, Los Angeles, CA 90042. Several maps
are available including A. L. Kroeber's classic "Distribution of
Indian Tribes of North America" circa "contact."

*Department of Anthropology, University of Chicago, Chicago IL 60601.
"North American Indians" (Indians as represented in the 1950 U.S.
Census, prepared under the direction of Dr. Sol Tax) [excellent
for use in a unit on the impact of World War II and Relocation
on Indian demography]

*"American Indians in the United States, 1980," compiled by Francis
Paul Prucha, S. J., with the assistance of Ardis Cameron.
Available through United States Geological Survey, Denver,
Colorado 80250

*Canada Map Office. "Canada: Indian and Inuit Communities and
Languages, 1980." Department of Energy, Mines and Resources,
Ottawa

SLIDE COLLECTIONS AVAILABLE FOR PURCHASE

Instructional Resources Corporation, The American History Slide
Collection, Master Guide: Uses, Captions, Index, compiled and
edited by Raymond W. Smock, William M. Stowe, Jr., and Peter
Daniel (Laurel, MD: Instructional Resources Corp., 1977)

U.S. Government, National Archives, Photographs of Indians in The
United States

U.S. Government, National Museum of Natural History, Selected
Photographs Illustrating North American Indian Life from the
National Anthropological Archives

U.S. Government, Smithsonian Institution Slide Set Series,
George Catlin, Painter of American Indians, text by John C.
Ewers, coordinated by Sarah McAnulty Quilter
The Paintings of Charles Bird King, text by Joshua C. Taylor and
Carroll S. Clark, 1978
The Battle of the Little Bighorn, prepared by Marion Ferguson
Briggs, 1976

Museum of the American Indian, Heye Foundation, Broadway at 155th
Street, New York, NY 10032
(Selections from the Museum's extensive collections available for
purchase).

*Pictures of Record. 119 Kettle Creek Road, Weston, CT 06883
"Archeological Slide Set" Series, including "Ohio Mounds,"
"Koster," "The Mississippian Cultures," "Poverty Point,"
"Marksville," "Early Caddoan Cultures," "Late Caddoan Cultures,"
"The Gulf of Georgia," "Ozette," "Chaco Canyon," "Mesa Verde,"
and "Canyon de Chelly."

CATALOGUES FROM MAJOR EXHIBITS

Ralph T. Coe, organizer, Sacred Circles: Two Thousand Years of North American Indian Art (Kansas City: Nelson Gallery of Art-Atkins Museum of Fine Arts, 1977)

Carolyn Gilman, Where Two Worlds Meet: The Great Lakes Fur Trade (St. Paul: Minnesota Historical Society, 1982)

Julia D. Harrison, Metis: People Between Two Worlds (Vancouver / Toronto: The Glenbow-Alberta Institute in association with Douglas & McIntyre, 1985)

Richard Conn, Circles of the World: Traditional Art of the Plains Indians (Denver Art Museum, 1982)

*David S. Brose, James A. Brown and David W. Penney, with photographs by Dirk Bakker, Ancient Art of the American Woodland Indians (New York: Harry N. Abrams in association with the Detroit Institute of Arts, 1985).

AMERICAN INDIAN ART AND ART HISTORY

Jamake Highwater, Song From the Earth: American Indian Painting (Boston/New York: New York Graphic Society, 1976)

George F. MacDonald, Haida Monumental Art: Villages of the Queen Charlotte Islands, foreword by Bill Reid; commentary by Richard J. Huyda (Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 1983)

Norman Feder, American Indian Art (New York: Harry N. Abrams, 1965)

American Indian Art Magazine, 7333 E. Monterrey Way #5 Scottsdale, AZ 85251

Edwin L. Wade and Rennard Strickland, Magic Images: Contemporary American Indian Art (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press and the Philbrook Art Center, 1981)

GENERAL COLOR-ILLUSTRATED WORKS ON INDIANS

James A. Maxwell, ed., America's Fascinating Indian Heritage (Pleasantville, N.Y.: The Readers' Digest Association, 1978)

William Brandon, The American Heritage Book of Indians, ed. Alvin M. Josephy, Jr. (New York: American Heritage Publishing, Inc., 1961)

SPECIAL REFERENCE WORKS WITH ILLUSTRATIONS

William S. Sturtevant, gen. ed., Handbook of North American Indians, 20 volumes in preparation (Washington, D.C.: G.P.O. for the Smithsonian Institution)

Example: Southwest, ed. Alfonso Ortiz, Volumes 9 and 10 (1979, 1983)

WORKS WITH EXTENSIVE ILLUSTRATIONS ON ANCIENT AMERICA

Jonathan Norton Leonard and the Editors of Time-Life Books, Ancient America (New York: Time Incorporated, 1967)

National Geographic Society, National Geographic Magazine (consult index for special issues)

Warwick M. Bray, Earl H. Swanson and Ian S. Farrington, The New World (London: Phaidon, 1975)

Donald G. Pike, with photographs by David Muench, Anazazi: Ancient People of the Rock (Palo Alto: American West Publishing Company, 1974)

Jesse D. Jennings, ed., Ancient Native Americans (San Francisco: W. H. Freeman, 1978)

John R. Swanton, The Indians of the Southeastern United States Smithsonian Institution, Bureau of American Ethnology Bulletin 137 (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1946)

Charles Hudson, The Southeastern Indians (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1976)

Stuart Struever, gen. ed., "Studies in Archeology," (New York: Academic Press)

James B. Griffin, gen. ed., "New World Archaeological Record" (New York, Academic Press) [very technical]

*David S. Brose, et al, Ancient Art of the American Woodland Indians (New York: Harry N. Abrams in association with the Detroit Institute of Arts, 1985).

*Archaeology, (Journal of the Archaeological Institute of America, 53 Park Place, New York, NY 10007)

SPECIAL TOPICS

"First Images of America"

Fredi Chiappelli, ed., First Images of America: The Impact of the New World on the Old, 2 vols. (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1976)

Emma Lila Fundaburk, ed., Southeastern Indians: Life Portraits, A Catalogue of Pictures, 1564-1860 (Metuchen, N.J.: Scarecrow, 1969)

W. P. Cumming, S. E. Hillier, D. B. Quinn and G. Williams, The Exploration of North America, 1630-1776 (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1974)

Stefan Lorant, ed. and annot., The New World: The First Pictures of America (New York: Duell, Sloan and Pearce, 1946, 1965)

Paul Hulton, ed., America 1585: The Complete Drawings of John White (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1985)

*Olive Patricia Dickason, Myth of the Savage and the Beginnings of French Colonialism in the Americas (Edmonton: University of Alberta Press, 1984)

"Historical Atlases"

Warren A. Beck and Ynez D. Haaze, Historical Atlas of New Mexico (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1969)

Henry D. Walker and Don Bufkin, Historical Atlas of Arizona (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1979)

James M. Goodman, The Navajo Atlas: Environments, Resources, People and History of the Dine Bikeyah (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1982)

John W. Morris, et al., Historical Atlas of Oklahoma (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1965)

Jeff Zucker, Kay Hummel and Bob Hogfoss, Oregon Indians: Culture, History & Current Affairs (Salem: Western Imprints, The Press of the Oregon Historical Society, 1983)

Helen H. Tanner, with Adele Hast and Jacqueline Peterson, Atlas of Great Lakes Indian History (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press for The Newberry Library, in press)

Lester J. Cappon, ed., Atlas of Early American History (Princeton: Princeton University Press for The Newberry Library and The Institute of Early American History and Culture, 1976)

*Carl Waldman, with maps and illustrations by Molly Braun, Atlas of the North American Indians (New York: Facts on File, 1985)

"Nineteenth Century Artists"

Alfred J. Miller, Braves and Buffalo: Plains Indian Life in 1837, intro. Michael Bell (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1973) [color plates]

- *Alfred Jacob Miller, The West of Alfred Jacob Miller, ed. Marvin C. Ross (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1951) [200 black & white plates of the Walters Art Gallery Collection, Baltimore, MD; color slides available through the Museum]
- James D. Horan, The McKenney-Hall Portrait Gallery of American Indians (New York: Crown Publishers, 1972)
- Davis Thomas and Karin Ronnefeldt, ed., People of the First Man: Life Among the Plains Indians in Their Final Days of Glory: The Firsthand Account of Prince Maximilian's Expedition up the Missouri in 1833-34, with text by Maximilian zu Wied; watercolors by Karl Bodmer (New York: E.P. Dutton, 1976)
- David C. Hunt and Marsha V. Gallagher, annot., Karl Bodmer's America (Lincoln: Joslyn Art Museum and University of Nebraska Press, 1984)
- "Photographic Histories"
- "Time-Life Books, Inc., "The Old West Series"
The Great Chiefs, text by Benjamin Capps
 (Alexandria, Va., 1975)
The Indians, text by Benjamin Capps
 (Alexandria Va., 1973)
- M. Gidley, Kopet: A Documentary Narrative of Chief Joseph's Last Years (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1981)
- Robert H. Ruby and John A. Brown, Indians of the Pacific Northwest, A History (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1981)
- Russell E. Belous and Robert A. Weinstein, Will Soule: Indian Photographer at Fort Sill, Oklahoma, 1869-74 (Los Angeles: The Ward Ritchie Press, 1969)
- William E. Farr, with a foreward by James Welch, The Reservation Blackfeet, 1882-1945, A Photographic History of Cultural Survival (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1984)
- Edward S. Curtis, Portraits From North American Indian Life, intro. by A. D. Coleman and T. C. McLuhan (New York: Promontory Press, 1972)
- Robert A. Roessel, Jr., A Pictorial History of the Navajo From 1860-1910 (Rough Rock, Navajo Nation, AZ: Navajo Curriculum Center, Rough Rock Demonstration School, 1980)
- Brigham D. Madsen, The Northern Shoshoni (Caldwell, ID: The Caxton Printers, 1980)
- Adolph Hungry Wolf, The Blood People: A Division of the Blackfoot Confederacy, An Illustrated Interpretation of the Old Ways. (New York: Harper and Row)

NATIVE AMERICAN PUBLIC BROADCASTING CONSORTIUM

The NAPBC is a non-profit organization that produces and distributes programs by, for, and about Native Americans. All programs are available on 2-inch quad, 1-inch videotape, 3/4-inch videotape cassette and 1/2-inch VHS cassette. Some programs are available in 16mm. For booking procedures and further information, write:

Native American Public Broadcasting Consortium
P.O. Box 83111
1800 North 33rd Street
Lincoln, NE 68501

Titles currently available include:

American Indian Artists
Ancient Spirit, Living Word: The Oral Tradition
The Art of Being Indian: Filmed Aspects of the Culture of the
Sioux
Canada's Original Peoples: Then and Now
Children of the Long-Beaked Bird
Dineh: The People
Folklore of the Muscogee (Creek) People
Forest spirits (7 programs dealing with the Oneida and Menominee)
Forgotten Frontier (Spanish mission settlements in southern
Arizona)
Four Corners of Earth (Seminole Women)
Journey to the Sky: A History of the Alabama Coushatta Indians
Man of Lightning (pre-contact Cherokee)
Menominee
Minorities in Agriculture: The Winnebago
Mother Corn
Navajo
North of 60°: Destiny Uncertain
On the Path to Self-Reliance
1,000 Years of Muscogee (Creek) Art
People of the First Light (7 part series about Indians in
southern New England)
Pride, Purpose, and Promise: Paiutes of the Southwest
Red Road: Towards the Techno-Tribal
The Real People (9 programs about the Northwest Plateau tribes)
Seasons of a Navajo
The Sun Dagger (Anasazi)
Tales of Wesakechak (13 part series based on Canadian Cree
legends)
Woonspe (Education and the Sioux)